

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. L. No. 19
WHOLE No. 1272

February 10, 1934

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS —Note and Comment.....	437-441
TOPICS OF INTEREST: The Negro and the Wage Differential by John LaFarge, S.J. —How History is Falsified by Hilaire Belloc—Sterilization Is Criminal Folly by Wilfrid Parsons, S.J.—Devaluation of the Dollar by Gerhard Hirschfeld.....	442-448
ECONOMICS: "The Crime of 1873" by Jerome J. Sullivan, S.J.....	449-450
EDUCATION: The Training of a Religion Teacher by Bakewell Morrison, S.J.....	450-452
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF by The Pilgrim.....	452-453
LITERATURE: The Writer Discovers Our Souls by Camille McCole.....	453-455
BOOK REVIEWS455-457..... COMMUNICATIONS ...457... CHRONICLE	458-460

February 12, 1809

ONE HUNDRED years ago, Abraham Lincoln, postmaster at New Salem in the State of Illinois, was down at the heel, and at his wits' end. He had just made a few dollars on a job of surveying for John Calhoun, but work of that kind promised few fees, and those far between. There was always a welcome for him at Aunt Hannah Armstrong's, where he could play with the children, or read, as he rocked the cradle of the youngest with his big foot, and then share the family's meal of corn-bread, mush, and milk. But he was now twenty-five years old, and prospects were dark.

The grocery store which he had bought in partnership with the bibulous Berry had "just winked out," leaving him with nothing but a reputation for honesty, and a crushing debt. In desperation he had turned his hand to anything that offered. He had split rails, helped in a smithy, and hired himself out as a farm hand. As postmaster of New Salem, he could easily carry all the letters delivered to the office in his hat, and he did. His emoluments for the year, even if they came to him in silver coin, he could have held in one big clenched fist. He might yet be obliged, he reflected, to make his living as a blacksmith, although that distasteful occupation would leave him little time for reading. Then there was Anne Rutledge. Did the girl really mean to marry John McNeill? The smooth-spoken, prosperous McNeill made him conscious that he was big, awkward, ill-clad, and shy, and put him at a disadvantage, he thought, with this blue-eyed, auburn-haired girl from Kentucky.

Born in a log cabin in Kentucky, Lincoln at twenty-five was inured to hardship and disappointment. As his mother held him in her arms, crooning to him the old songs that her people had carried with them across the

seas from England, she may have dreamed, as mothers will, that this child at her breast would one day equal in renown the heroes of whom she sang to him. But it was the lot of Nancy Hanks to give us Lincoln "and never know." She did not know that he was to enkindle in the world a flame which, please God, can never be extinguished so long as men love liberty and seek after justice. She did not know that he was to live for fewer years than three score, and ending a pilgrimage over hard and lonely roads, leave a name that the world can never forget or fail to honor.

She did not know these things. Nor, looking at Lincoln in New Salem, "getting an education," as he said, "by littles," did anyone know them.

Add twenty-five to the sum of his years. On his fiftieth birthday, Lincoln was a moderately successful country lawyer. He had served four terms in the State legislature, and at the age of forty had finished his only term in Congress. Then he went back to his law office in Springfield, and kept aloof from politics until the Autumn of 1854. In the following year, he appeared before the legislature as a candidate for the Senate of the United States. He was beaten by Lyman Trumbull. Three years later, he was a candidate against Douglas, and was beaten again. At the end of that campaign he wrote a friend, "I am absolutely without money now, even for household expenses." Once more he went back to the practice of law to get his bread, "disappointed but not discouraged." At fifty years of age, Lincoln was giving a lecture now and then, usually on "Discoveries and Inventions," in some little Illinois town, but without much success. The dreams his mother dreamed seemed farther than ever from fulfilment.

But the man had long been trained to face defeat. It did not discourage, however much it disappointed him.

He was growing in power of thought and in sure insight. His lawyer companions on the Illinois circuit, rising in the morning, would find him huddled over the gray embers of the open fireplace of the inn, silent and abstracted. In the turn of the night, and as the cold dawn crept over the prairies, he envisioned the glory to which he gave undying expression in the "Gettysburg Address." What he said at Gettysburg did not spring on the moment from the tired brain of a sorely tried man, nor did the occasion inspire them. Those thoughts had lived in his mind for more than forty years. They were born of the years of his childhood in Kentucky, when his mother read to him from the Bible; of the years in the clearings in Indiana, where, so soon, his mother died, bidding him with her last breath to love God, obey his father, and be good to his little sister; of the long years in Illinois, first of striving and of obscurity, then of a widening fame and greater conflict on a national field. All the years of his life, from Kentucky to Washington, with their wisdom and experience, won through hardship, disappointment, and failure, merged at last to make him

The kindly-earnest, brave, foreseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil, the first American.

So runs our thought, yet who can say what it was that made Lincoln Lincoln? In him was malice toward none, but charity for all, a keen intelligence, ambition without guile, a conciliating spirit that fitly tempered his unbreakable tenacity of purpose. But what made Dante a poet, Beethoven a musician? To each God gave rare opportunities for sacrifice, and after that He gave to Dante, to Beethoven, and to Lincoln, "genius." There is no other answer.

Some Banks and Your Money

TWO weeks ago an amiable gentleman from Detroit was testifying before the Fletcher Senate committee. Under the prodding of Mr. Pecora, he agreed that he did not know very much about his bank, although he was its president at \$50,000 per year. "Then you were just a figurehead at \$50,000 a year?" pursued Mr. Pecora. Quite airily, the bank president admitted that Mr. Pecora had described the situation with adequate accuracy.

Now it would be absurd to indict all the banks in the United States. Even under a wretched system of Federal examinations, probably the majority of the banks still serve the public, and protect their depositors. But far too many are governed by officials whose knowledge of banking culminates in their conviction that they may use as they see fit all moneys which come into their hands. The Detroit bank president was probably not conscious of any impropriety in taking \$50,000 as a remuneration for no work at all. Apparently, the directors of that bank were equally unconscious of any impropriety in voting him that sum. Nor, as far as the record discloses, do the Federal statutes frown upon a bank which in this fashion throws money out of the window. Like the renowned George Washington Plunkett, officers, directors,

and Federal statutes seemingly regard these perquisites as honest graft.

This custom of distributing large quantities of honest graft in the guise of salaries appears to be an approved practice in some banks and in many corporations. As long as banks and corporations are permitted to maintain imposing ranks and tiers of directors who do not direct, who do not care to direct, and who would be incapable of directing even the affairs of a peddler's push cart, did that necessity devolve upon them, the custom will be retained. The incompetent and negligent directors will be hoodwinked by the speculative and dubiously honest sections of the boards, and the public will continue to be swindled. Writing in the *New York Times* on "the lessons of the banking inquiry," Senator Fletcher once more suggests that "directors should be compelled to direct." He might have added that incompetence or negligence, as well as actual dishonesty, should be heavily penalized.

In a true sense, all directors are trustees. In this capacity, they are obliged in conscience to guard with intelligent care all interests entrusted to them. If through culpable negligence or culpable ignorance these interests are damaged, the duty of restitution cannot be avoided. A directorship is not primarily an honor, but an obligation to work. In a trial in the criminal courts of New York two years ago, consequent upon the failure of a large city bank, it became appallingly evident that a majority of the bank's directors knew little or nothing of the institution's condition at a time when it had been hopelessly insolvent for several months. It was not claimed that these directors, nearly all of whom were men high in their respective professions, were dishonest, but it was plain that many were incompetent and that nearly all of them had been negligent. Perhaps the tremendous losses sustained by the American people in the last four years will at last awaken them to the necessity of insisting that directors must direct, or be held responsible for their failure to direct competently and honestly. A group of directors drawn from Sing Sing and Joliet could not have served some of these wrecked banks and corporations more disastrously.

Loyal Employees

IN a public address last week the Secretary of Agriculture praised "the loyalty, efficiency, and cooperative spirit" of Federal employees in general, and of the employees in his Department in particular. The Secretary made no excursion into the realms of fancy to find material for his remarks. They are sober truth. While we marvel at the fact, we wonder how long it will remain a fact.

But as the Secretary was speaking, some 500 substitute post-office employees were marching to Washington. They bore with them banners displaying such devices as "Government Employees Have No Code. Why?" "Millions for Subsidies and Starvation for Substitutes," "Too Many Promises and No Relief," "The N.R.A. Is Not Elimi-

nating the Sweat-Shop Government Office." These legends are also sober truth. How long will the Government allow them to remain true?

For the simple fact is that the Government uses methods in dealing with its employes which Administrator Johnson declares are abominable. He was not speaking of the Government when he used the phrase, but of a tinker's shop in Yonkers. Still, if the tinker and the Government employ the same methods, the Government merits a stronger condemnation. The tinker's cruelty extends to few, and gives small scandal. The Government's extends to more than a million, and is a national scandal.

Perhaps the Government honestly intends a better deal for all wage earners. If so, it should begin with its own employes. When the largest employer of labor in this country cuts wages openly by fifteen per cent, and covertly by at least an equal amount, through the device of enforced furloughs without pay, it cannot complain if the small employer follows its example.

Through the wage cut, the Government saves \$100,000,000 per year. It will lose ten times that amount should the cut forfeit the confidence of the average citizen in its Recovery program. There are times when "saving money" is the worst form of economy, and this is one of them. For the sake of its major purposes, the Administration should at least put its employes back on the old wage scale. But an advance in wages would be more in keeping with its avowed purposes.

Catholicism on Broadway

WHAT one of New York's critics wryly denominated "the current religious dramatic season on Broadway," took another big step in the right direction on January 26 when Philip Barry's "The Joyous Season" had its opening at the Belasco Theatre. In one leap our second playwright jumped clean out of the Animal Kingdom into the Kingdom of God. We will leave to Elizabeth Jordan the function of appraising its dramatic and acting values, but surely the coming to Broadway of such a completely Catholic play is a matter for editorial comment and even wonder.

This very enjoyable comedy in which Lillian Gish plays a nun who swiftly overnight brings her laxly Catholic brothers and sisters in Boston's Beacon Street back to a sense of the joy and meaning in their almost forgotten religion is a symptom and a symbol. Neither Barry nor O'Neill can be accused of using the Catholic theme merely for the purpose of discovering new dramatic situations. It is obvious to those who have seen their plays that they sincerely see in the Catholic religion unplumbed depths out of which can be drawn the solutions to life's problems themselves. Curiously enough, Francis Thompson's "Hound of Heaven" plays an important part in each of their plays. It is the "unwearying feet" of Christ in the modern world seeking out His own that symbolize not only the thought of the minds of these playwrights but of the hearts of men in a disillusioned and despairing day.

Our sympathies go out to the dramatic critics in a difficult situation. Their printed comments on "The Joyous Season" were polite but frigid. But one of them the night of opening was heard to remark in a weary voice, in response to a question, "I don't know what the hell is the matter"; and another, "There's too damn much Catholicism." In each case the mild profanity was an indication of a puzzlement that is easily explained. That our first and second playwrights should in a single season choose the Catholic theme for plays, and present the result in an obvious expectation that they would reach the hearts and touch the imaginations of audiences, all this was honestly too much for them.

Father Gillis, in the February *Catholic World*, has certainly put his finger on the reason. To them, and to all their world, there was simply no drama in these plays. They were boring, clumsy, and unreal. Where audiences were amused and delighted by Barry and deeply stirred by O'Neill, the worldly were simply spectators on the side. When the embers of religious faith have burned down but still live, they can be fanned to life again; where they have died and are cold, there is nothing but the dust of boredom in blowing on them. The charming scenes of Barry's Farley family amusingly reacting to the presence of a blithe Mother Superior in their midst seemed to them utterly without motivation; as no doubt for them it was. What it will do with New York audiences remains to be seen; but the growing success of O'Neill's "Days without End" seems to betoken that people are hungry for religion, even on the stage.

All of this should not be without meaning for our younger Catholic writers. No writer in modern days has even come near to sounding the unsuspected riches that lie in Catholic doctrine and worship. Publishers of books and producers of plays have never become persuaded that enough imagination and emotion exist there to justify an appeal to the general public. Nor have our writers had the audacity to be wholly Catholic and dare all on their Faith, as have Bourget, Bazin, Bordeaux, Baumann, Mauriac, and Claudel in France, all of them writers of the first flight. But O'Neill and Barry, each in his different but characteristic way, were big enough to dare. They have broken the way; let lesser writers follow.

What Is Money Worth Now?

IN his Christmas Allocution the Holy Father told the story of the big banker whom he questioned on the financial situation in the world. The big banker had no answer, he had no opinions, he had no views; he said that nobody knew anything. That very sensible banker, however, was not followed by a multitude of variously interested individuals who drew the most wildly different conclusions as to what was likely to follow the maneuvers of the Administration on the gold standard. The most sensible conclusion was that nothing would follow, at least not immediately. But some hoped that their debts would be cut in half; others feared their wages would not be doubled to meet a doubling of prices. The fact

that the "gold content" of the dollar was to be cut in half was taken to mean that anybody who had a dollar before January 31 would have two dollars after that day. When that curious result did not follow, many people must have felt deep disillusionments about their temporarily favorite economists.

It is true that some monetary economists hold that the price level depends on the current value of gold, though variations of prices at that level may not do so. But the effect of the gold cut on both debts and prices is very problematical. If I owed \$10,000 on January 30, I will still have to pay \$10,000 on February 28. If I had to pay it in gold, it would take me nearly \$20,000 in currency to buy the gold to pay the debt with, it is true. But since I will not be able to buy the gold, my creditor will have to take my check or paper currency for \$10,000. With that he will be able to buy only \$5,000 worth of gold, but he will still be able to use the money I gave him as an exchange medium between \$10,000 worth of goods. Money, therefore, will still remain money; not wealth, but the means to exchange one set of goods for another. If the price level gradually rises, as it probably will, as a result, not of the gold cut but of returning confidence, then his \$10,000 will be worth less and less in terms of goods. If he has to buy abroad, and send gold in payment, he will still be able to buy \$10,000 worth of goods there with the gold he buys, if foreign currencies are stabilized at a fair rate in accord with ours. That is the real problem for our Government now.

Note and Comment

Chapman on Guard

IT was nothing, said the editor of *Harper's* in the January issue of that periodical, that the late John Jay Chapman talked about Alfred E. Smith as a Catholic. "Those things were incidental, as was his assault on the inclusion of James Byrne in the Harvard Corporation." Chapman "knew" that Smith is "an admirable man," and Byrne to be admirable as well.

But when he shot at Byrne and Smith his target was the great organization, perhaps the most powerful that exists. . . . He did not want the Roman Catholic Church to obtain increased control of education in the United States, and that was a legitimate objection. Catholics might say their prayers and get to heaven their own way without criticism from Chapman, but control of American education was another matter.

The editor did a service by stating the case so plainly. He declared precisely the objection that Catholics have to Harvard, or to any other secular university. Catholics may be tolerated at it, but when it comes to even such a minority part as single representation upon the Board of Trustees, Chapmans and other righteous men rise up in horror, and remind us that the University has a sacred right to deliver its message of monolithic Protestant education untainted by any possible contamination from the thought of the Church Universal, the Church of Paris

and Padua or ancient Oxford and Cambridge. A James Byrne may give a lifetime of culture and public service to his city and to his nation. But let his little finger get "control" of that education, which, in the same issue, Nathaniel Peffer finds "at sea and rudderless," by suggesting in a board meeting some of the steadying cultural influences of the ages; and America is doomed.

The Irish In Russia

THE Irish, said Charles J. O'Malley, of Boston, speaking in December to the Catholic Alumni Sodality of that city, have left their impress on the Russian and Baltic territory. "I know that Danzig boasts of a Bishop O'Rourke, and that Catherine the Great asked Louis XIV to send her the best soldier in his army. He selected Count Peter Lacey of Limerick, Ireland, who taught the Russians how to fight." Mr. O'Malley might have added that an Irishman, Sean Lester, is now the High Commissioner of Danzig. Russia, too, left its impress upon the O'Malleys, father and son, Louis J., an engineer, who explored it last summer: an impress painfully similar to that of other disillusioned American engineers. They found the entire technical equipment of the principal engineering plant of Moscow housed in an enormous space, and consisting of just forty-eight lathes, the sole technical equipment for the 20,000 graduates put through the school in 1929, and the 200,000 in 1930. At Rostov:

One of the main specifications called for modern hygienic plumbing. Fifteen thousand men and women were to be employed and 3,000 toilets and 3,000 showers were provided for. They put up the machinery, built the foundations and the building, put in the toilets and the shower baths—and then didn't connect the water. The toilets were being used for lunch counters and the showers for clothes closets.

Of a piece were their experience with food, and with moral conditions. Moral: to advertise "Luxury in the U.S.S.R." keep the Irish out and let Louis Fischer continue to treat of silks and satins in the *Nation*.

A Don't for The Fire Chief

THE next time you drop into a Broadway playhouse, take a look at the official fire warning printed in your program. Here is what the New York Fire Commissioner, over his signature and in bold, black type, orders you to do: "In case of fire, walk (not run) to the nearest exit!" That uncouth negative, smacking of blue uniforms, red tape, and the police blotter, has been printed in programs for so many years that one wonders how it escaped ridicule in "Of Thee I Sing." The sentence becomes all the more ludicrous by the fact that it is addressed to theatregoers, who for the most part are literate persons and accustomed to correct grammar. When people assemble in a theater to hear lines written by Maxwell Anderson, Eugene O'Neill, or Philip Barry, they are likely to be a bit unnerved by this appalling solecism hurled at them before the rise of the curtain. Indeed the more sensitive among them will be sorely

tempted to run (not walk) to the nearest exit. In these exciting Manhattan days, when corruptions and blunders on the part of city officials are being exposed, is it too much to hope that the reform Administration will do something about official corruption of grammar and official blunders in English? When John J. Dorman lost his job and Mr. McElligott assumed office as Commissioner, this column anxiously awaited a rewording of the fire warning. But the new chief merely deleted his predecessor's name and signed his own. "Walk, not run!" is still the official command. But perhaps this column is too optimistic. Maybe it is too much to expect good grammar from Fire Chiefs—on the radio or in the theater.

General Houses, Inc.

THE town of Norris, Tenn., to be built by the Tennessee Valley Authority near the new Norris Dam, is to outdistance anything yet attempted in this country in the way of ideal planning. The architect, Roland A. Wank, has not gone so far as to introduce "houses like Ford" of the type prophesied by Buckminster Fuller. Nevertheless, the Norris, Tenn., adventure is a step towards this consummation, when houses will be turned out as completely rationalized, as completely adapted to the ends of warmth, spaciousness, light, ventilation, general comfort and esthetic livableness as is a Fisher body to the special needs of the automobile owner. Imagine "utility units" dropped into the house as a motor is lodged in its frame! Already the business world is beginning to lick its chops over this future industry. "General Houses, Inc.," says Douglas Haskell in *Harper's* for February, is obviously modeled upon General Motors. Before, however, this monster is born and gets upon its rampant way, will we bethink ourselves of the social obligation that this future industry entails? Can we remember the truth that Basil Walker spoke in an address on January 25 to the New York Chapter of the National Catholic Alumni Federation: that the purpose of business is not to "make money," but to provide what is needed for society? Surely if any thing would pertain to our basic needs, it would be such a housing industry; which should not be thrown to the fangs of laissez-faire.

News Reel Blunder

THE Paramount News Reel people would probably be deeply shocked if this Review accused them of immoral propaganda. AMERICA is careful not to make that accusation, for it has always applauded Paramount's wise policy of never allowing moral standards to be attacked, or even debated, in its news reels. This Review is fully aware that free love, for instance, has never been allowed in Paramount News as a subject of discussion. Nor euthanasia. Nor the pros and cons of divorce. Paramount, moreover, never did permit Judge Lindsay to advocate trial marriage in its weekly record of events, nor Margaret Sanger to plead for birth control. But just two weeks ago Paramount made a bad mistake. Dr. Lorenz, the famous Austrian medico visiting this

country happens to be a nice old gentleman with an extraordinary charm. Doubtless in photographing him Paramount was primarily interested in a vivid and engaging public figure, sure to delight film audiences. But unfortunately they allowed him to make a vigorous, persuasive, and wholly one-sided plea for sterilization. As an article in this issue of AMERICA points out, sterilization has an ethical aspect. Millions of people, among whom are all Catholics led by the Pope, condemn it as immoral. Paramount should realize that its recent news reel has shocked and antagonized millions of its patrons. Universal and Fox were much wiser. They filmed Dr. Lorenz, but he discoursed only of health and longevity.

A Clerical Dramatic Season

IN checking up the balance of the present theatrical season, the historian will certainly put it down as a clerical one. There is Father Baird in O'Neill's "Days without End," of which the last scene is a corner in a Catholic Church, with a Crucifix furnished by the Liturgical Arts Society. There is the apostate priest John Knox in Maxwell Anderson's "Mary of Scotland" thundering against poor Mary's having introduced the Mass into Scotland again. There is the Bishop in Hugh Stange's melodrama, "False Dreams, Farewell!" who converts his old atheistic friend back to the Catholic Church and gives absolution to the drowning passengers as the liner goes down. There is the unseen but felt presence of the Catholic Church in Leopold Atlas' poignant study of the son of divorced parents in "Wednesday's Child," from all accounts a convincing human document on the evils of divorce. There is Mother Superior Lillian Gish (reverting to her ancestors, the Guises of France) taking hold of a tepid Catholic family and sending them all off to church, and happiness. Where all this will end, no one knows. A play is now in producers' hands in which all the characters but one (a little boy) are Jesuit priests. And Gertrude Stein is coming along with a musical pageant called "Four Saints," one of whom is reported to be St. Ignatius Loyola. But let us hold our breath. Maybe Gertrude Stein will redress the balance. In any case, our readers will no doubt gleefully agree that there is already enough to justify the profane comments of the critics which are chronicled on another page.

AMERICA A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

PAUL L. BLAKELY	WILFRID PARSONS Editor-in-Chief	JOHN LAFARGE
GERARD B. DONNELLY	FRANCIS X. TALBOT	DANIEL BASSETT
	FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN	
	Associate Editors	
	FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, Business Manager	

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: ME 4allion 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Negro and the Wage Differential

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

WERE the entire recovery program of the President to fail, and the most doleful forebodings of Ogden Mills to come to pass, one great result would be achieved. The intimate connection between economic and moral problems would have been demonstrated. That such an intimate connection exists was undoubtedly fully present to the mind of the President and his assistants in framing the various acts. Nevertheless, the proof thereof has come with startling suddenness in the case of the Negro. As was remarked by the Rev. Francis J. Haas, Director of the National Catholic School for Social Service in Washington, and member of the Labor Advisory Board of the NRA, speaking in Cleveland last September at the session of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems: "The situation of the Negro under the NRA is the greatest concern to those responsible for the act."

Discrimination in the relief program has still been calling forth abundant protests. "Last week \$4,000 was paid to whites and not a cent to Negroes," wrote a Negro from Fort Lauderdale, Fla., to Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The most widespread grievance has been the fact that the Negro worker, as was stated in the annual report of the same Association, "under the national recovery program has suffered displacement from many of his old jobs and in others he has had to accept discriminatory wage rates with differentials as high as thirty per cent."

In the earlier phase of the industrial recovery program, an attempt was made to evade the racial issue by establishing an "occupational differential." Out of 13,000 Negroes employed in the cotton-textile industry, for instance, over 10,000 fell under the special exclusion from the wage program established for "outside workers," such as cleaners, janitors, etc. So in other codes. Other devices were resorted to, such as a sort of economic gerrymandering, by which lower wages for all workers were decreed for localities where the population was largely Negro. The "economic grandfather clause" was resorted to by a considerable number of codes, ordaining that "the minimum wage shall be forty cents for those who were previously receiving thirty cents, and thirty cents for those who were receiving less, etc."

None of these devices, however, have succeeded in freeing the code makers from the dilemma of either paying equal wages to the Negro, or else finding some actual justification for the differential: if not for racial, then for "climatic, geographical," or other reasons. Just how far these alleged justifications can stand up under factual analysis was clearly brought out at the hearing which took place recently in Washington before Deputy Selfridge, in charge of the code of fair competition for the lumber industry. Mr. Selfridge was addressed at this hearing by John P. Davis, executive secretary of the

Joint Committee on National Recovery. Mr. Davis is a Negro. His committee represents twenty-two national organizations, which have combined to protest against the wages and hours established for the southern branch of the lumber industry.

Ninety-eight per cent of the nearly 25,000 Negro lumbermen, raftsmen, and woodchoppers in the United States were, in 1930, in the southern branch of the industry. Of the total number of Negro operatives in saw and planing mills, eighty-two per cent were in the southern region in 1930 and ninety-six per cent, or over 90,000, of all Negroes classified as laborers in saw and planing mills were in this same region. Despite unemployment a relative percentage for the South has remained the same.

Minimum wages tend to become maximum wages where Negro workers are involved. "At once," said Mr. Davis, "the least tenable and the most dominant reason offered by industrialists for lower wages in the South is that a differential has always existed. The fact that wage slavery exists in the South is no justification for its continuance, . . . The only justification for considering this argument at all is that it still recurs." Can the difference in the cost of living be alleged as an excuse for the differential? Abundant facts and figures were produced by Mr. Davis to show that cost of living can be no explanation for maintaining different wage standards. He observed:

"I want here to give you, Mr. Administrator, the benefit of an investigation made by me personally in the South. It so happens that I visited in November and December of 1933 the very regions of South Carolina and Georgia represented in Congress by the two gentlemen who spoke this morning and who are urging a downward revision of twenty-five or thirty per cent in the wages of large numbers of their constituents.

"I did not visit all of the lumber mills in these areas, but I did have the opportunity of seeing the conditions under which many Negro lumber workers are existing.

"Two things stand out as a result of this trip:

"First, that where, as is true in many cases, the saw mill operates a mill store, prices are higher than those obtaining at stores in the nearest villages.

"Thus, the prices of flour, rice, coffee, fatback, beans, and sugar, staples which constitute the major portion of the diet of low-paid workers in these areas, have been increased in their retail price at mill-owned stores out of all proportion to any wholesale price increase that may have been experienced.

"The entire system in the South is paternalistic."

Imagine, said one of the members of the Code Authority who described to the writer the overwhelming effect of Mr. Davis' testimony, two Congressmen actually urging a *downward revision in the wages of their own constituents!* The complete dialogue took place at

the close of Mr. Davis' statement which urged that it should be "the insistence on the part of the National Recovery Administration to secure adequate data upon which to evolve an adequate wage scale for the United States." Mr. Davis gave specific names and places of code violations:

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. You make no difference for climatic reasons?

"MR. DAVIS. Absolutely none. That is pretty much of a joke. *I can say that it is a joke, and I think that anyone truly familiar with the situation would say the same thing.*

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. For example, if the contractors who put in the heating plants put them in the same for both sections of the country, you would have one situation, and if they do not, you would have another.

"MR. DAVIS. If they should put into a hotel in the South the type of furnace just as they are used in the North, it might make some difference, but, on the other hand, it might cost considerably more to heat a hotel in Spartanburg, South Carolina than to heat a similar hotel in Lewiston, Maine, although it *would* cost the same if they are the same type of buildings. If you have a ramshackle sort of building down in South Carolina, it will cost you more to heat it than it will cost to heat a well-built home up in Lewiston, Maine. Therefore, it seems to me that that sort of a problem is largely a joke.

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. That is not the point I had in mind. I was speaking of the climatic conditions, but I was not referring to the heat.

"MR. DAVIS. You said climatic conditions.

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. I was thinking of *efficiency* as affected by climatic conditions.

"MR. DAVIS. The question of efficiency. I think that is another bogey which has continually appeared at these hearings, and for which there is a *very adequate answer*: Efficiency is recognized, by persons who have studied it in an unbiased or unprejudiced way, to be dependent, very largely, upon the standard of living. I have no doubt that when people do not get enough to eat and when they are living under very inferior conditions of crowded houses and insanitary conditions, their standard of efficiency would be lowered, and I think my standard and your standard of efficiency would be lowered also under those conditions. The best way to improve efficiency is to improve the standard of living in which the workers live.

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. May I ask this question: Do you think that you could turn out more manual work in the State of Maine than in Washington in the summer time?

"MR. DAVIS. Maine happens to be my home for the past five years, and I can give you *specific* information in regard to that; it is pretty hot there in the summer time. I have been down here in Washington in the summer time also. I have worked hard, and I have fared very well while I have been working here in Washington. I have worked on many of these Codes, and I have done fairly well, so I am told. (Applause)"

After this the Deputy dropped the subject of "climatic urge," though he made one last desperate attempt.

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. Is there anything in the *lack* of climatic urge?

"MR. DAVIS. I am speaking as an authority on that, and answer you, categorically, no.

"DEPUTY SELFRIDGE. Thank you. (Great applause.)"

No community can benefit by the economic disfranchisement of any of its own members. By simple justice, which will also encourage workmen to make profitable use of their earnings, and not by elaborate excuses, will prosperity be restored.

How History Is Falsified

HILAIRE BELLOC

(Copyright, 1934)

THE Oxford historian and politician, Sir Charles Oman, read a paper in the Oxford Town Hall last November, the substance of which was reprinted in an article in the *Record* a month later (December 19). The title of this address was "The Necessity for the Reformation." The paper was of course, as was only to be expected from its authorship, in tune with the general anti-Catholic spirit of the University. But it is not with that I am here concerned. I am concerned with it as an example of "How It Is Done," i.e. how a false historical impression is created with the object of confirming the bad doctrine and consequent bad morals of the heretic world, and undermining the Faith in those who possess it and who fail to "spot the trick."

Note first the title. We are told that we are about to hear an historical argument proving the necessity for THE Reformation: not for "A" Reformation; mark the distinction.

This is not a small verbal point, it is the very essence of the matter. No one with the least instruction on the end of the Middle Ages (the generation which was mature in the year 1500) questions the necessity for a reformation at that time. For that matter, there is no period between this and Pentecost when reform within the Church, or any other institution, was not necessary, nor would institutions survive unless reform were continually at work upon them. The same is true of every individual human character; and the cause of that truth is a certain Catholic doctrine called "The Fall of Man," on which it would be interesting to have the considered opinion of your typical Oxford Protestant historian of the present day—but he would be shy in answering.

There had been accumulating before the year 1500, and ever since the Black Death a century and a half before, a great number of evils peculiar to the time in the human conduct of religion: worldliness and greed in the Hierarchy, the degradation of the Holy See, first, through a schism, and then through its subjection to temporal and political influences: laxness in many monastic houses: the use of religious endowment as a mere source of income: loose morals, especially amongst the higher clergy—and so on. The enemies of the Catholic Church very greatly

exaggerate the evils of the time, but that they were present it has never occurred to anyone to deny.

But "The Reformation" does not mean the setting right of these evils. It does not mean the securing of a series of good Popes; the restoring of religious endowment to its proper uses; the severe correction of immorality, especially in the higher clergy. It means none of these things. It means a definite historical event of two-fold character, negative and positive. It means, negatively, the destruction of the Catholic Church over great areas of what was once united Christendom. It means, positively, the setting up in those regions of something very well known and highly characterized called *Protestantism*. By his choice of title Sir Charles Oman can only have meant, certainly did mean, and did undoubtedly convey to his readers, that he was about to give historical proof for the necessity of this double action. It was necessary and good (says he) for the Catholic Church to be destroyed; necessary and good that the state of mind and morals which is called Protestantism should be set up in its place.

A Reformation was necessary: granted. But the thesis is not that. The thesis is that *the* Reformation was necessary.

Sir Charles Oman proceeds to prove his thesis by reciting a lot of the most elementary stuff with which every educated man is familiar, such as that Alexander VI was a bad character; that people were indignant of the condition of church government at the end of the Fifteenth century, and so on: and he tells us that he has found all this out by a lot of recent and profound personal research on his part, a claim which (if it were accurate) would give special weight to his position.

All these commonplaces have nothing to do with the supposed thesis to be proved. And yet on one who does not "spot the trick" the recital even of such threadbare and elementary common or "board-school" history might have a pernicious effect. It might confirm one who had always been told that the Catholic Church was detestable and its Protestant opposite good, it might even weaken one who knew by experience that the Catholic Church is divine, but who had no sufficient experience of its enemies.

Such, I say, might be the result on anyone who did not see "how it was done." And yet the trick here played is of the simplest kind. It is *the use of the same word "Reformation" in two different senses*. The mind is first led to consider the word in one sense, and is then switched off to considering it in the other, as though they meant the same thing. If the reader is not sufficiently alert, he may well confuse the two.

There are hundreds of words with which this trick can be played, and played it is most assiduously in this kind of misleading sophistry. The reader is made to agree that there was a necessity for reform, he then finds himself sidetracked into agreeing with the particular evil shape into which the reform fell.

The point at issue in the whole controversy is not whether a reformation was necessary: the point is agreed

to by all. The point is whether *the destruction of the thing to be reformed was necessary*. It is a bad thing that evil men should say Mass. Is it therefore a good thing to curse with the vilest abuse the presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament on the Altar? *The Reformation* did that. It is a bad thing that religious endowments should be used for the lust of the flesh, for banquets and pageantry, and worse. Is it therefore a good thing that they should be handed over as loot to lay millionaires? That is what *The Reformation* did: it is *that* which, according to Sir Charles Oman, was so necessary. One must repress a tendency to idolatry. Is it therefore a good thing to deny the power of the saints and to forbid the invocation of them? That is what *The Reformation* did. It is a bad thing when authority is misused, and unity is made a plea for tyranny. Is it therefore a good thing to leave the world without an admitted authority in morals? In that case any abomination may be tolerated, as today, under the last effects of *The Reformation*, pretty well any abomination is tolerated.

If your mother is ill there is a "necessity for" getting rid of the illness. Is there therefore a "necessity for" murdering her, calling her every bad name under the sun, denying her authority and telling the neighbors that she had no right to the name she bore and was illegitimate?

Let us take a parallel case which I think will appeal to Sir Charles Oman: that of the modern English Protestant Public Schools. Will anyone say that there is no case for moral reform here? If so, he will get very few people in Europe to agree with him. Are we therefore to think that it would be a good thing to destroy the classical and scientific teaching the Public Schools provide, to let rich men loot their furniture and books and take their buildings, to hand over their property and incomes to robbers for their private enrichment, and to persecute all those who teach the doctrines they had taught on public spirit, patriotism, and discipline?

I have said nothing of Sir Charles Oman's article in the matter of accuracy or historical sense. That hardly concerns my exposition of "How it is done." I need only refer to examples. Thus, it is odd to read at this time of day the words *New Learning* used ignorantly to mean Renaissance scholarship. That was a familiar howler of Green's, common in the Oxford of forty years ago, and I myself have fallen into it. The *New Learning* meant, of course, not Greek, etc., but the *new false doctrines*, the word *learning* being then used as the sense of our word *teaching*. Again, it is surprising to hear, even from Oxford, the idea that Catholics regard the Pope as "all-righteous." Again, it is absurdly unhistorical to represent the English of Anne Boleyn's day as moving in a tide towards Protestantism, with difficulty restrained (and that for a moment only) by the power of the king. You might as well say that England of today is moving towards Communism in the same fashion. As for the word *glubelline*, that is obviously a slip for "ghibelline," but I know from plenty of personal experience that inevitable slips of this kind when they fall from a Catholic pen are treated with a severity I forbear to use here.

Sterilization Is Criminal Folly!

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

IN "Brave New World," that delicious satire on the philosophical vagaries of the well-known mathematician, Bertrand Russell, Aldous Huxley reduces the whole eugenic fallacy to an absurdity which rather startled the shallow who somehow felt vaguely that here was another modern prophet who had let them down. In fact, rather significantly, the book gave immediate rise to the rumor that Mr. Huxley was about to take the step of submitting to the Catholic Church. The rumor was unfounded, but it was, in its way, a subtle tribute to the unique position of the Church itself. It was an admission that only a Catholic-minded person could have freely used his pure reason and seen so thoroughly through the unscientific and inhuman speculations that would reduce even the reproductive functions of mankind to the will of the slave-owning State, which Eugene O'Neill has just recently called "the most grotesque god that ever came out of Asia."

In Mr. Huxley's comic Utopia of the Eugenists, babies are conceived not only out of wedlock, but in a test tube, and as they grow up are sterilized; or if they are not, they are required to be constantly armed with contraceptives, so that no one would be born without the consent of the rulers of the State. The point of the satire was that eugenics logically calls for not only "well-born" individuals, as the name implies, but a whole series of nicely graded morons who were produced to do without complaining the heavy and dirty work of the world.

The satire was not overdone. Just the other day, Prof. W. D. Tait, of McGill University, Montreal, condemned the sterilization movement on the purely pagan (and mistaken) ground that it would destroy all the morons, and "modern civilization needs the higher type of moron and even the lower types for such work as construction, ditch digging, farming, and mining." (Totally imbecile children he would destroy at birth, though how he would find that out so soon he did not explain.) Professor Tait's worries are all taken care of by Mr. Huxley.

Meanwhile an attack on sterilization has arisen from another quarter. Hitler announced the horrid news that sterilization of nine classes of defectives (moral and physical) was henceforth the policy of the totalitarian State of Germany. For a short time after that sterilization was unpopular over here, especially as Hitler was not merely talking, but proceeding promptly to sterilize. But by the time of the New York convention of the American Birth Control League, some would-be sterilizers, though still embarrassed by their new ally, had begun to take heart, and sterilization appeared in the lady president's eight-point program. The conclusion of the discussions that followed seemed to be that sterilization was all right, but that Hitler was not the man to be allowed to handle it.

The position of the Church in all this is well known.

As an *aim*, it also is in favor of eugenics; it is in the choice of the means to this end that it disagrees with the professional agitators. If the means is a morally bad one, then no good end, however desirable, will ever make that means an allowable one. It is the eugenists who hold that the end justifies the means. In fact, their argument is that since the end of securing a physically perfect society is a good one, as all agree, then any means that will bring this about is a good one.

Many of the Church's matrimonial laws are in essence eugenic measures: the prohibition of marriage within certain degrees of kin (where defective genes are more likely to coalesce) or under age, to give two instances. Where the Church parts company with the eugenists, particularly the sterilizers, is in the choice of the means to this desirable end. There are certain human rights which both the Church and the State are bound to respect; and the right to reproduce one's kind in wedlock is one of these. The foundation of this right is the individual's duty to observe the hierarchy of ends that exist within him. Reproduction is a function whose end is social, not individual; its end is superior to the individual himself and he and the State are both subject to it. Neither may do anything which either in the act itself or before the act deliberately makes its fulfillment physically and artificially impossible. (What nature does is quite another thing, about which the individual has no moral concern, and hence the marital act of the naturally or accidentally or temporarily sterile does not fall under the case.)

But eugenics as a science and an art falls in two classes: there is the positive end of studying the best means to improve the race and the exercise of those means; and there is the negative side which consists in attempting to eliminate the "bad" strains altogether, so that only the "good" strains survive. The positive kind of eugenics is a normal instinct, and is constantly fostered by the pastoral care of the Church exercised through teaching and advice; by encouraging marriage of the fit, etc., though never under any moral compulsion. There are not wanting those outside the Church who would like to have the State declare who should marry, according to some preconceived but necessarily imperfect standard of fitness, set up by self-constituted "experts." In the same way, on the negative side, the Church will dissuade from obviously unfit matings, though only in the case of some diseases will it declare any moral obligation not to marry. Modern eugenics is chiefly interested in the negative sphere, through voluntary or compulsory sterilization of the "unfit." The philosophy of this is most completely seen in Hitler's pagan doctrine of the sacredness of race. In rejecting that, the present-day world comes close to rejecting sterilization, too, which is its corollary.

The clearest indication, perhaps, that it is a violation

of the natural law is to be had from the highly unscientific nature of the proposal itself. The laws of nature itself, as modern biologists have discovered them, show conclusively that the plan is illusory, even for its own purposes. In the December number of the *Linacre Quarterly*, organ of the Federated Catholic Physicians' Guild, Dr. Alexander Fraser, a distinguished authority, completely demolished its pretensions, basing his demonstration entirely on the known laws of biology. It is not even a sound means to the objective sought, the purifying of the race of inheritable defects.

The eugenic purpose of sterilization is based on the possibility of eliminating from the race all the defective genes. (A gene is an element in the chromosome of the parents which is a determiner of the physical characteristics of the offspring.) The sterilizers simply propose to find out all the male and female defectives in the country and make it impossible for them to transmit these genes. Their proposal is based on a complete misconception of the laws of biology, as Dr. Fraser has no difficulty in showing. There are not one, but two ways, by which defects are inherited: the person may be feeble-minded, and thus be easily recognized; but on the other hand, he may be entirely normal himself, but a "carrier" of a defective gene. You could eliminate all the known feeble-minded, but how are you going to find the carriers?

For this an explanation is necessary. If each parent has a defective gene, and if when they mate each defective gene occurs in the same order in the chromosome, then the offspring will be defective. This is the most favorable condition in which feeble-mindedness, for instance, can be inherited. It has been calculated that if the feeble-minded were one per 1,000 population, then by sterilization of all feeble-minded individuals it would take sixty-eight generations, or 2,000 to 3,000 years, to reduce the proportion to one per 10,000. This is because most feeble-minded persons are born, not of the feeble-minded, but from "carriers," that is, by those normal persons who have a single defective gene in their chromosomes, and to produce an individual with the defect indicated, would have to meet another individual, defective or normal, who has a defective gene in the same order. Two feeble-minded persons, on the other hand, as is well known, can generate a perfectly normal, even superior, child, because their defective genes are in different positions in the chromosomes. This is alone sufficient to show how hopeless the eugenic proposal is.

But there is more. There are different kinds of feeble-mindedness, due to different kinds of genes. This greatly adds to the simple case calculated above, as is clear. The probability of elimination becomes less, as the number of kinds of defective genes increases. Moreover, to add to the preposterousness of it all, in the vast majority of cases, as Dr. Fraser points out, it is a fallacy to think that "each individual characteristic has its corresponding gene." It takes hundreds, maybe thousands, of genes to determine one characteristic. How are you going to search out, even if it were possible, all these genes, so as to

eliminate the defective ones? The probabilities decrease to the vanishing point.

And to make the demonstration simply crushing, Dr. Fraser recalls that a gene is not "something that gives rise to a unit characteristic," but "something that in a given environment gives rise to a certain characteristic." Thus a child may be the offspring of two parents each with a defective gene in the same position, and yet not be defective himself at all, unless he develops in an environment favorable to the cultivation of the effects of that gene. Finally, and worst of all, Dr. Fraser tells us, "we have abundant evidence that they [defective genes] are being manufactured in normal individuals perhaps as fast as we could possibly get rid of them."

From this demonstration, taken merely from the known facts developed by experiments under Abbot Mendel's law, it is perfectly clear that eugenics, and particularly that form of it which demands sterilization of the "unfit," is probably the most gigantic and cruel hoax that has ever been foisted on a credulous and ignorant people.

Not only, then, is sterilization an immoral means to a desirable end, but science shows that it is a useless one, thus immeasurably adding to the criminal folly of those who advocate it.

Yet in twenty-eight States of the Union ignorant legislators have been deluded into foisting the stupid thing by law upon their constituents. What is worse, according to the figures given by the "Human Betterment Foundation" itself, since these laws were passed and up to January 1, 1933, males and females have been sterilized by force in State Institutions to the number of 16,066; in California alone, 8,504. And this in the name of a pretended scientific law that science itself repudiates! Dr. Fraser drily remarks, with much reason, that if there were any means of detecting those who should be sterilized "it is quite possible that so many eugenists would be elected that the whole eugenic movement would be stopped."

Is it any wonder, then, that on March 18, 1931, the Holy Office declared that "the theory of eugenics is to be held entirely blameworthy, false, and condemned," or that in his Encyclical on Marriage Pope Pius XI used even stronger words of condemnation? Moreover, only recently, in an address to the Cardinals in Rome, he once more inveighed against the tyranny of the absolute State which usurps a power over the bodies of its subjects which it simply does not possess. He spoke in the name of individual liberty. I think that if the citizens of those States where sterilization laws are on the books knew the true facts about sterilization there would be a revolution there. The stupid legislators who thought they were listening to the voice of science, when they were only hearkening to ignorant fanatics, would be put where they belong: and the fanatics themselves would be restrained forever, as agitators against liberty and decency.

Here, if anywhere, is a case example of how we lose our liberties. The race is not going to be improved by any tampering with nature; nature itself repudiates the effort. Yet we supinely allow materialistic writers and

agitators to go along blithely assuring the world that they have the only cure for its ills. Are they any different from fake patent-medicine vendors? Credulity and ignorance are what make these fakers able to impose on their pathetic dupes. In the case of sterilization, it is something worse. It is loss of faith in a spiritual world—the free will of a man, which is what makes him good or bad,

criminal or law-abiding; supernatural grace, and the means of grace, by which alone we can achieve God's pleasure; and the love of God, by which alone we can permanently love our neighbor and obey our laws. The moral conduct of man is not dictated by his genes, but by his free will corresponding to grace. And that means by his cooperation with Christ living in the world.

Devaluation of the Dollar

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD

ONCE in a while it is refreshing to get away from books, theories, and reflections. Once in a while the shortest route is to go back to common sense, to ask the man in the street; though monetary matters do not appear to lend themselves easily to such simplified treatment. Anyhow, I tried it; with some success—to that extent, that there was a sort of unanimity in the answers. When confronted with the question: "What would happen to prices and debts, if we cut the dollar into half?" this was the reply, with all kinds of variations: "It would be the greatest thing that could happen. What we owe, would be half as much. And what we have, would be twice as much."

Venturing further into the subject, it was explained that, while prices would go up, their rise would lag far behind the immediate rise in wages. The trend of opinion may perhaps be best summarized in this way: the dollar as we have it is too high. So let's hand out to everybody two dollars. Or, what amounts to the same, let's halve our present dollar.

It is my earnest belief that these few scores of opinions which I gathered represent (or come pretty near to representing) a cross-section of people's attitude toward the dollar throughout the country. To them a dollar is a dollar; it is always the same piece of paper, sometimes new and stiff, and sometimes smooth and worn from frequent handling. To halve its value, can only mean to issue two pieces of dollar bills for every one we have, since, quite obviously, we cannot very well take the scissors and cut every dollar in half, and call each piece a dollar.

The reader knows that this attitude is wrong. He knows also that any value which the dollar may have does not come from the piece of paper on which it is printed, but only from the value which that dollar can buy. But if he is aware of that much, he cannot possibly close his eyes to the fictional significance of changing the dollar's value. If he can keep the two things apart—the dollar as a bill, and the dollar as a buying medium—he must inevitably cross the Rubicon at one time or other, and must definitely decide for himself on this question: what is more important, the dollar as a bill, or the dollar as a buying medium (or value, if you wish)? What comes first? Which moves the other? Then he will know his way in this monetary maze in which we are roaming right now.

Things are being thrown at us in a hurry: "depressing the dollar," "raising prices," "deflating debts," "thawing out credit." It is small wonder that out of the variety of subjects which come under the heading of monetary policies, enough theories, economic and otherwise, have grown and blossomed to keep us—in difficulties for the next hundred years. Truly, prices and debts and credits all have something to do with the dollar. But there must be some sequence as to their importance. What, then, comes first? And what would be most fundamentally affected if dollar devaluation has any bearing at all upon our economic system? In my opinion, it is neither prices, nor debts nor credits, but salaries and wages. The buyer is first and last. Without him, production, prices, etc., are meaningless.

With the dollar cut, say, in half, the mechanic at \$40 a week may expect to get \$80. In the past, he got two \$20 bills. Cut in half, with a pair of scissors, if need be, he would in the end have four pieces of paper which, at the old value of \$20 would make \$80. Simple enough. Of course, he has no idea of cutting and spoiling his bills. He rather expects in his pay envelope next Saturday twice as much. Now imagine his surprise if he opens that envelope and finds the same old \$40 inside. In a hurry he runs around the corner to his friend, the baker:

"Say, hasn't the dollar been cut in half? And I get the same pay!"

"Well, what's wrong with that?"

"How can I pay for the bread and butter and an overcoat and a lot of other things with the same amount of money? Prices must now be twice as high!"

"What are you talking about! Why should I raise the price of bread? Wheat still costs about a dollar a bushel. A year ago the price was only 55 cents, and then the bread was cheaper. But since then we had all that recovery, and the farmers got better prices for their wheat."

"Yeah, but they didn't change the dollar. Now that it has been cut in half, I am supposed to get twice as many dollars. And the same with your bread."

"Oh, don't be silly! What am I interested in the dollar? All I care about is what it costs me to bake the bread. Let 'em cut the dollar as much as they want. I don't know anything about it—and I care less."

And so, our friend, the mechanic, will make the round, and he will hear the same story from the textile manufacturer and the milkman, the grocery clerk and the hard-

ware salesman. They will all hope that somehow they will get twice as many dollars. But at the same time, they will go on with their routine calculations: so much the raw material, and so much the cost of manufacturing, and overhead, and taxes, and labor, and interest, rent, light, profit, etc. And they will be waiting in vain for that "dollar cut." For, as likely as not, they will have never been told that the ones that can "cut" the dollar, are they themselves, and nobody else. They can raise their prices, this will cut the (buying power of the) dollar. Or they can lower them, so you can get more for the dollar. In other words, the buying value of the dollar makes the dollar bill. Regardless, of how large or small it is printed; regardless of how many dollar bills are issued, that much may be considered definite: the buying value of the dollar is its only measurement. From which you may draw your own conclusion: that no change in the monetary system alone, no matter how conceived, can change the intrinsic value of money.

How in the world did we ever come to the curious concept that the dollar is a "value"? We didn't come to it in this country. It came about through foreign valuation of American currency. In the United States the value of the dollar is the things it buys. Abroad it is valued in relation to foreign currencies. It is valued higher in one country, and lower in the other. There is a big difference in this valuation. Between April and December, 1933, for instance, the dollar dropped 45% in England. It took 45% more to buy a British pound. In the same period, it cost 57% more to buy a French franc. But it cost only 17% more to buy something (wholesale) in America. Without taking anything away from the importance (or lack of importance) of dollar valuation, we may as well forget the foreign aspect. The problem right now is dollar devaluation at home.

Prices will not react on dollar devaluation because prices did not ask the dollar for any definite valuation in the first place. Instead, if it may be put this way, the dollar always inquired about prices in the various fields of economic activity before assuming one or the other "value."

With debts the situation is only slightly different. Debts have been contracted at a certain time at a certain price. If prices do not change, if the dollar buys just as much after as before devaluation, then it is clear that there is no effect whatever upon debts. It has been the hope of inflation advocates that inflation of the currency would practically do away with debts. So many millions, and even billions, of dollars would not only be printed but circulated that you would get perhaps a hundred dollars for what used to be ten dollars. In this case, debts would be decimated. Similarly with revaluation. The illusion that halving the dollar (a purely nominal procedure) would mean halving the debts, parallels the fiction that is current about prices. In times of inflation, as they had it in Germany, debts went down because prices soared skyward. The moral in regard to debts is this: debts change their monetary value, if prices do.

A far-flung dream, indeed, is the idea that devaluation

has anything to do with credits. Theoretically, credits can be issued on the strength of currency; and currency can be issued on the strength of gold holdings; the former ratio is 10 to 1, the latter 3 to 1. Thus, on a gold hoard of four billion dollars, we could issue 12 billions in currency, and on the latter again 120 billions credits. But it doesn't work in practice. The depression has taught us that credits are issued if they are reasonably secure and, most important, if they are profitable. In the last four years both requirements were lacking to a considerable degree; hence, credits were lacking. If there were to be any credit revival in the wake of dollar devaluation, it would have to come over the price route. With prices higher than they are, with profits larger than they are, with wages better than they are, those who are in a position to grant credits would have no difficulty finding either the security or the profits, or both.

We come back to prices, the alpha and omega of the problem which confronts the Government. Prices are made by factors different from monetary policies. Mr. Jones will not be so anxious to carry every available penny to the savings bank if he can be reasonably sure of his job. That is confidence. Manufacturers may go ahead with plans of expanding production if they are convinced that inflation is definitely out of the question. This points to the factor of monetary stability. The farmer might agree that reduction of acreage is really a good thing if he sees that any possible profit lost by such reduction would be made up (as is the case) by the bonus payment the Government allows. This would raise prices.

In short, psychology plays a large part in price fluctuations. In the end, they are not caused by technical factors at all. The force behind them is distinctly human: the hope to gain, which generally leads to higher prices; and the fear to lose, which lowers them. This is explained by the fact that one causes increased demand, the other the contrary.

It is for this reason that any advantages to be derived from the new dollar may be looked for on the psychological side of the ledger. It will do away with whatever fear there was of inflation of the currency. With the margin of 10 cents (between 50 cents and 60 cents) for which the President asked Congress, the monetary policy is rather clearly defined. It plays into the hands of a large group which prefers to look upon devaluation of the dollar as a sort of inflation. But by far the greatest advantage, indeed, the only one I can detect, lies in the President's proposal that title to all the monetary gold in the United States be vested in the Treasury, that it be withdrawn from circulation. This eliminates one glaring fault of the gold dilemma of past years when gold was taken as a monetary (and supposedly inflexible) standard where at the same time it was bought and sold like a commodity and was as such subject to the law of supply and demand with all its fluctuations. Naturally, the gold standard rocked back and forth with the arbitrary changes of the price of gold. This will be eliminated by the new decree.

Economics

"The Crime of 1873"

JEROME J. SULLIVAN, S.J.

AS in every crisis since 1873, the silver controversy has once more come to the fore. The old Populist demand for free silver is pleaded by statesmen and others in language and manner reminiscent of the Great Commoner. All the old arguments are being advanced again in substantially the same form as they were proposed two generations ago, notwithstanding the fact that the claims of silver were decisively answered in 1896 by the people of the United States. And subsequent events, instead of weakening, have greatly confirmed the validity of that answer.

The whole question of bimetallism is a subject too wide in scope to be discussed here. However, there is one aspect of the debate that merits consideration. Some agitators for silver monetization have chosen to bolster up their case by appeals to passion, and by false recrimination to confuse the issue. Just as in 1893, so in 1933 our financial woes were attributed to a grave injustice perpetrated by the bankers of this country through the instrumentality of our legislators. Once again the graphic phrase, "the crime of 1873," is used to stir into action the sense of justice innate in every American. Through fraud and deceit and for sinister motives, it is alleged, the coinage of the silver dollar was discontinued in 1873.

Historical evidence, however, of which there is an abundance, does not warrant this charge. Silver and gold had always been traditional American coins, but during the forty years prior to the Coinage Act of 1873 little of the former had been coined or circulated. In fact, it was possible for one to grow to manhood before the Civil War without ever using or even seeing a silver dollar. When the Government returned to routine duties upon the cessation of the conflict between the States, a revision of all the laws relating to mintage and coinage was suggested. With that in view the Comptroller of the Currency and the Director of the Mint were appointed to study the question and draw up a report. The personnel of this committee, as well as the report submitted by it in 1870, show clearly the purpose of this Act. The bill as a whole was a "mint" bill, designed to codify existing coinage laws and to revise those in conflict with current technical and commercial needs. Such revisions had been made before: for example, in 1834 the weight of our gold coins was reduced; in 1837 an increase in the weight of both gold and silver coins was decreed; similarly, various enactments had amended the laws relative to the coinage of copper and the subsidiary coins. Technical considerations governed all these proceedings, nor were any of them criticized until certain events subsequent to 1873 made it convenient for the silver interests to label the revision of that year a "crime."

Until 1873, gold or silver bullion might be taken to the mint to be coined into dollars at the ratio of 16 to 1, or,

to be exact, at the ratio of 15.988 to 1. At this figure silver was slightly undervalued, with the result that it disappeared from circulation as a medium of exchange. Possessors of silver naturally sold the white metal in the commercial market, which was paying a higher price than the Government mints. They would not be expected to exchange silver bullion worth one hundred and two cents for a silver coin worth one hundred cents.

Theoretically this country was on a bimetallic basis from the beginning, but as a matter of fact only one metal was in actual circulation at any given time. In the original mint bill enacted April 2, 1792, Hamilton had attempted to establish a bimetallic money, fixing the relative rate, or coinage ratio, of silver at 15 to 1 with gold. Gold was speedily withdrawn from circulation, for the metal contained in the gold dollar was a few cents more valuable than the silver dollar. In 1834 the coinage ratio was changed to 16.2 to 1, and in 1837 to 15.988 to 1, in order to keep both metals in simultaneous circulation. But a Government decree cannot control the commercial ratio of silver to gold, for it cannot govern the rate of production of the two metals. The result of these revisions in the '30's was merely to change the inequality. The silver dollar, though constantly fluctuating, was uniformly more valuable than its gold associate, and disappeared from use. In brief, the United States was, practically speaking, on a silver basis exclusively for the first four decades, while during the following forty years the white metal was rarely seen in the form of dollars. Silver was just as effectively demonetized in 1834 as it was in 1873.

The movement, therefore, to revise the mint regulations after the Civil War was simply an attempt to bring the laws into conformity with actual reality. The first bill to carry out general revision was introduced in Congress in April, 1870; although passed by the Senate the following year, the bill failed through lack of consideration in the House. The next session of the House debated the bill and passed it in May, 1872; reintroduced into the Senate, the bill was approved January 17, 1873, with no dissenting votes.

In this Coinage Act of 1873 the only mention made of any silver dollar was one of 420 grains; this was slightly heavier than the old standard. Termed the trade dollar it was not intended for general circulation, but was designed to meet the demands of foreign balances, especially in the Oriental trade. At the time the omission of the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains called forth no comment. Silver producers with an attractive industrial market for their product were not particularly interested in the bill; Senators from the silver States spoke and voted for the bill. The Act affected only the technicalities of coinage and incidentally the needs of those engaged in trade with countries on a silver basis.

There is no evidence showing that this Act owed its origin to a conspiracy on the part of bankers and capitalists. The price of silver remained practically stationary during the three years the bill was before Congress. No one could have foreseen that the production of silver would soon outstrip that of gold, and thus cause the unit of the former to shrink in value. This legislation was not rushed through Congress by stealth, nor was any trickery employed to effect its passage. The measure, with its content clear to any one who chose to read, passed through the usual course. In short, fraud was not intended nor was any committed. At the time of its passage it was not even hinted that the Coinage Act of 1873 was a "crime."

Shortly thereafter, however, due to causes entirely extraneous to, and in no way consequent upon, this piece of legislation, the price of silver declined sharply. The market was deluged with a flood of silver; nor was this because the mint was dammed up against it, for, as we have seen, scarcely any silver had been presented at the mint for forty years. The price of silver fell from normal forces affecting its rate and cost of production. The extension of railroads into the mining country, new discoveries in chemistry and metallurgy, better engineering devices, all worked together to reduce the cost of extracting silver. The discovery and development of new deposits further accelerated the decline in the value of the white metal. In the two decades following 1873, the output of silver was almost tripled.

Naturally, those who were interested in silver as a salable commodity now protested against its demonetization. They persuaded themselves that the Act was fraudulently conceived and unjustly passed, and spoke of it as "the crime of 1873." In one of the later debates in the Senate, Senator Stewart of Nevada denounced it as such, and was promptly put to confusion by the reminder that he had himself spoken and voted for the "crime." The sinister phrase, however, was perpetuated by silver agitators, and the currency magicians, who crop up in every depression, still take delight in inveighing against the "crime of 1873."

That catch phrase was overworked by the monetary theorists *pro tem.* to explain the panic of 1893. They demanded the repeal of that unjust Act as the solution for the current financial woes. Truth and reality are aligned against this position however. In the clear perspective that we now enjoy of those trying times, it is quite evident that the fear of free and unlimited coinage of silver, with the consequent establishment of the silver dollar (that might be worth anywhere between 50 and 100 cents), as a standard, precipitated the crisis forty years ago. It is certain, too, that the way to recovery at that time was not paved with silver, but that, on the contrary, recovery was effected, at least in part, by a courageous disavowal of the baser metal.

Silver was interred over a generation ago, but in our day new champions would restore it to life. In their attempts to do so, they, as their predecessors, pretend to plead a case of justice: silver was demonetized through

fraud and deceit in 1873; its remonetization is simply the legislative righting of a legislative wrong. But the evidence submitted above belies the charge. Whether or not expediency dictates some form of bimetallism or symmetallism, we do not here attempt to say. But if silver protagonists wish a fair and honest hearing, let them base their case on arguments of worth and integrity. Silver holds no brief in justice for remonetization, for silver was not put out of circulation by a "crime."

Education

The Training of a Religion Teacher

BAKEWELL MORRISON, S.J.

IN the November (1933) number of *Scribner's* there occurs this statement near the beginning of an article: "It seems clear that no religion based, as Catholicism is, on an audacious, majestic assumption of authority, with no foundation in historic fact, can ever meet the need of a world that has learned to think for itself in terms of reality." In *Harper's* for September (1933) we find an article beginning: "'Sex is God's one blot upon Creation,' the early Christian Fathers declared, not once but with frenzied repetition." Now granting that neither the instructors in religion nor, *a fortiori* the students, are going to be devoted to reading such "heavy" literature as that afforded by the two magazines just quoted, still one can never quite evade the fact that some members of every class will do some reading, that the challenges flung by the "popular" literature of the day do raise questions to which a Catholic young man or woman should know the answers.

The contention that the routine courses in theology fit any priest with automatic and convincing replies to every question that may emerge from the chance remark of some one or other of the frequent sciolists who supply our popular magazines with their articles on religion is hardly founded in fact. Routine courses in theology prepare a man to prepare himself for the fine points, and for the fulness of learning that are required in one who would teach a subject, and pre-eminently for one who would teach so all-embracing a subject as religion. For in teaching religion, since one is teaching a way of life, and is hardly adequate to the task unless he himself feels and makes his classes feel too that Catholicism is not a casual or incidental thing, but a habit of life and a way of thinking and willing and loving, the instructor has to range the world. Like the devil, who presented himself before the throne of God and boastfully announced that he had been "around the world and through it," the instructor in a religion class must in this be pretty much of a piece with his arch-enemy.

This article is not intended to be a criticism. But it is intended to express certain facts which the author's own experience has taught him. And one of the foremost of the facts which experience has brought home to him is precisely this—his theology is a thing that can never afford to stand still, to vegetate, to grow rusty, or

in which he can put the confidence that it will produce an immediate and pointed retort or answer to everything that comes up. Like the doctor or the lawyer, the theologian is handling a living thing. His preliminary studies prepare him to begin at long last to practise, and thus, therefore, continually to help himself to greater and wider knowledge and expertness and at-homeness in the problems that can vex and sometimes torture the minds of men.

Religion is a thing that changes its outward appearances not at all in the Catholic Church. The dogmas do not shift, the worship and the devotional practices do not change in essence, though they put on a freshness with each succeeding age, the Code does not vary. Nor, in fact, do the men and women who profess it. But the attacks, the applications of these dogmas and this code, the perplexing problem of translating into the age-old and venerable language of the Church, hardy, vigorous and indispensable, as well as sacred and most apt, the exact meaning, or lack of meaning, that informs the *ingesta moles* of so much modern thought, takes effort and the wrinkling of brows, and furrows on the forehead, and work. It requires unceasing work. And it requires, therefore, a zest for work, and a love of learning, and a certain hardihood of intellect, and a vast and most absorbing interest in the facile and febrile minds of youth.

Christ taught. His teaching is the model for all time. But His teaching is obviously suited to the minds that heard Him, so redolent of the land that nourished Him, so instinct with the life that was being lived about Him. His dogmas, etched on the eternal plan of immutable truth, yet live with the breath of personality, and pulse with the vivifying power of the grace of God. He knew men. He knew His times. He knew how to teach because He knew how to reach the heart; and supremely and superbly He knew how to catch and hold and fire the enthusiasm of those who with simple hearts came to hear Him.

His place is being taken by the religion teachers. In dusty, grubby lecture halls He stands forth again in the soutane or habit of His religious and his priests. They, therefore, must duplicate His witchery. By the fervor of their love they must learn to put the "new wine" of His dogmas into the "new bottles" of the youth who are thirsting—sometimes all unbeknown to themselves—for the solacing and confirming voice of the God-Man.

To be concrete as to some of the items which the author has found most helpful in his work in the religion class (and he is a "full-time" teacher of religion and does not feel that therefore he is engaged in a lesser work than if teaching English or mathematics or the languages) perhaps foremost among the studies which have been a solace and an assistance and a stimulus he can list "Character Education." That, of course, is a term to conjure with in these times. That subject is "popular" with a vengeance. But it has many angles and many points of view which are indispensable for the modern religion teacher. "Character Education"

deals with the raw product that comes to school and how to make a "man" of it. It professes to acquaint its students with the whys and wherefores, the whims and fantasies that run riot through the minds of children. It attempts grandiosely to interpret the "main-springs of men," to put one in touch with the motives that are found to be natively successful in influencing man, to elucidate the most difficult art of delineating and making living and desirable an "ideal."

The study of "Character Education" forces one to con his psychology, to "get up on" the modern science of experimental psychology, to learn the "trade names" of modern "science," to appreciate the fact that the adolescent is not the adult, that, while the child may be "the father to the man," he is not that father yet. It is delightful study because it ranges the activities of children and their capacities and tries to make intelligible that microcosm that is man.

"Character Education" will necessitate some acquaintance with and appreciation of the "-ologies" (Freud, Adler, Jung) and with the Catholic writers who are purifying some of this very literal "muck," like Thomas Verner Moore, O.S.B., like Martindale (who, however incidentally he does it, yet does make the essential truths of human nature appear out of the miasma of some-time nonsense that is called psychology), like Allers. "Character Education" will force a re-thinking of one's moral theology because so much of what is good in it will be at first vaguely, and then increasingly reminiscent of the age-old wisdom of the Church regarding the motives of men and the devious ways of excusing one's self, and of the power of temptation, and of the loveliness of virtue—all of which points are the very bone and essence of Moral.

"Character Education" will bring one to formulate again, and in perhaps clearer and more specific theory than ever Rodriguez did it, the Christian ideal of asceticism. The world abhors the very word *penance*, and glibly prates of masochism or sadism when it recounts with fearful shudders and much timorous glancing over the shoulder, the actual hard living and harder penance that distinguish some of God's Saints. And youth today with whoops of joy is willing enough to cast off this essential tool for self-mastery. Even the wise advise a certain bending to the weakness of constitutions and a certain care of the "nerves." But the path of blood-tracked steps that was traveled by the God-Man poses the irrefutable proof that humanity needs a corrective for pride and a check on indulgence, and that the "essential goodness" of human nature cannot dispense with the rod of self-control, nor banish to the Limbo of forgotten and unmentionable things the vigorous practices of the Saints.

The quotation, second from the beginning of this article, will show how pertinent it is to know the facts and the theory of the "early Christian fathers" on this point. Next in order of interest and of utility may be listed some delightful browsing among the engrossing tomes on archeology, Lanciani, Ramsay, and—though

rather incidentally—Lebreton. It is of value to have picked up (with Flinders Petrie at your elbow) stuffed and dusty crocodiles from their long-hidden Egyptian graves, and in disgust or petulance at finding crocodiles and not men-mummies, fling one heartily from you and discover, when the dust has settled, that out of that musty safety vault have tumbled manuscripts of ancient Egypt. It is a pleasure to scramble up a hillside outside Damascus on a sweltering afternoon along with some French engineers who are running a power line into the town in view of "tram cars," and find your heels tapping a lost and unexpected inscription that reinstates in profane history "Lysanias of Abilene" of whom Luke spoke.

Paul Elmer More can tell us, "My position with regard to the literary and historical problems of Biblical criticism represents what seems to be the solid results of the past century of German investigation." And, while he rejects their philosophy, he contents himself with their findings. Now, it is true enough that such a position is untenable because their "findings" are, demonstrably, I think, the results of their philosophy. But the point is that the "findings," however derived, are the stock in trade of the magazine writer and preacher. No better antidote for these "findings" can be discovered than a dose of research on the original position and in the field.

Finally, to be brief, a heavy dose of logic is required in order to keep one's intellectual feet from slipping out from under one. Chesterton and Belloc drive home with sledge-hammer blows the logic of Catholicism. And they do much to discomfit the perennial adversaries of the Church. Their tool cannot be neglected by one who wishes to forearm and equip the credulous youth of our day against the more or less patent sophistries of their fellows. How, for example, can one meet the hoary chestnut that there is no God because, while it is claimed that God can do everything, even He cannot make a square circle, unless logic comes to the rescue with a definition of terms and an understanding that a thing cannot be and not be at the same time and under the same aspect?

Logic, of course, is taken in one's stride in seminary or college. But the logic that is taught has to be diluted with practice; the rules that are learned have to become expert tools with actual usage. The teasing fineness of thought that logic demands, the disregard for emotion, the careful weighing of terms and their meaning, the ability to stick to the point and not be run off onto side trails by the proverbial "red herrings"—all these require more than a textbook knowledge, more than the necessarily superficial assets that a course in the subject confers.

Thus (not to be tedious) it would appear that the instructor who would make a life's work, or even an incidental subject, of religion, would do well to gird himself and settle down to a well-guided course of supplementary reading before he venture to step into a lecture hall where Religion 32 or 43 or even 9a is being offered.

But, if he does this reading, if he sharpens and refreshes his already satisfactory knowledge, he will be opening up for himself sweet evenings of delight in preparation for class, and he will be putting at the Master's happy disposal the proper tools wherewith that Master can fashion from the hearts of our glorious Catholic youth fit models of Himself.

With Scrip and Staff

POVERTY from too much wealth! This outstanding phenomenon of our time still calls forth our surprise; so that we easily forget that history repeats itself.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century Don Juan Nuix, a Spanish, or rather Catalan, priest, published a learned work in Italian in defense of the Spanish colonial regime, in answer to the attacks made upon it by such writers as the French Abbé Raynal and the Scottish Dr. Robertson. The work was translated into Spanish and published in Madrid in 1789, under the title "Reflexiones Imparciales Sobre la Humanidad de los Españoles en las Indias."

Among other matters, Don Nuix takes up the accusation that the Spaniards brought about the ruin of their colonies through their own avarice and pride. In refutation of this charge, the writer makes the plea that the depopulation of the colonies was the result not of any special fault of the Spaniards, but rather of natural social and economic causes which would operate in any part of the world where excessive wealth had been concentrated. The same would have been true of the French, or the British colonies, had they been blessed, or cursed, with the discovery of as much gold and silver as the Spaniards. (And, the Abbé slyly notes, they would have gone to such lengths as did the Spaniards had they seen the opportunity.) Extreme opulence in metallic wealth, says Don Nuix, brings of its own accord a decay in the necessary arts of life. "Abundance of [metallic] money makes the fruit of labor pass to idle hands," and he continues:

In that sort of a State people wish to live by sales, exchanges, loans, and every kind of credits. The ease of living without work fills up the cities, and gradually depopulates the countryside. The illusion increases, propagates itself and spreads from day to day. Public debts are contracted, and in order to increase the circulation of riches papers are created which are given in discount for these debts.

As a consequence, agriculture and industry suffer. So that "every nation that has too much money (and not Spain alone) verifies and carries out the fable of the dog [which dropped the bone in the water at the sight of its own reflection] when it gives preference to signs and appearances over reality." Thus, he adds, the public creditors of Great Britain have made her lose her colonies.

The immense riches of Spanish America represented "practically nothing." Why? Because money is but "secondary wealth." It does not circulate for its own sake, but for the sake of the "primary riches" of industry and agriculture, which give it movement. "It has value

only when it represents merchandise." In view of this he reaches his conclusion; which is that the abundance of metallic wealth in America impeded and suppressed industry; and with that suppression, came the destruction of the very things that gave that metallic wealth its value. There was no one to sell to those who had the gold and silver, because those who were deprived of money were unable to produce; and so consumption perished. "From lack of consumption came lack of labor; and from lack of labor the decay and destruction of industrial arts." "Because of its great, or rather excessive possessions, the nation came to have less and less, and to lack even what was most necessary; so that finally it fell into misery, which of all things is most prejudicial to the growth of population."

If some of the great minds of the nineteenth century who exercised themselves in picking flaws in the Spanish record had studied more deeply the truths pointed out so eloquently by Don Juan Nuix a century before, the world might have been spared some of its present distress.

POVERTY has no romance. Looked at in itself, it is ugly and painful. There was no romance in the poverty that surrounded the birth of the Saviour. The circumstances were utterly humiliating. The glory of that birth was in the Divine love which could triumph over those circumstances; so that the very cave and straw become symbolic of that love.

That a poor woman walked nearly 100 miles to give birth to her male child in a barn on January 20 of this year, may have no significance in itself, save as another case for charity. But it does appeal to us that in the midst of our civilization a human being can have an experience so startlingly familiar in outward circumstances to that of the Mother of God. Mrs. Addie Crawford, who had walked nearly 100 miles in search of a grown son from her home in North Carolina, where her husband had deserted her six months previous, to the home of Mrs. Brownlow Dilbeck, near Benton, Tenn., had refused to sleep the night in Mrs. Dilbeck's house; and contented herself with the barn. Says the *Chattanooga Sunday Times*:

The infant's clothing was an old coat, taken from his mother's back. His bed was of straw, his birthplace was a corn crib. They found them there—the mother clutching her new-born babe to her breast and shivering from cold. She smiled a smile of gratitude when they found her. Her eyes shone brightly as she looked at her babe—he was there.

The local physician found both mother and child in "good condition," none the worse for the scriptural experience. And both were promptly lodged in charitable Mrs. Dilbeck's home to be cared for until relatives could be found.

AUSTRIA is fortunate in having at its head so determined a friend of the poor and the laboring man as Chancellor Dollfuss. At the conference of the League of Nations held in Geneva the Chancellor declared: "Austria shall be erected entirely upon the principles contained in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI

("Quadragesimo Anno")." But the children and youth of Austria must be grounded in those ideas which are necessary for a Christian State. There is still a desperate struggle there against the atheistic Socialist and Liberal campaign. Hence the Austria Bishops appeal to the world for contributions, however, small, for the *Kindergroschen*: a "Penny-for-the-children" movement. Those who wish to aid in this noble task may send contributions to The Catholic Action, Maria Theresa St., 40, Innsbruck, Austria; or to Rev. C. M. Over, 335 Guilford St., Buffalo, N. Y.

THE PILGRIM.

Literature

The Writer Discovers Our Souls

CAMILLE MCCOLE

ALL day Dallas Lore Sharp and some of his illustrious friends had trudged through the woods surrounding John Burrough's rustic cabin, the sequestered Slabsides. And then, when night had begun to quilt the valley, they all walked down the slope of the mountain, over rocks and through brush, until they came to the car. They had helped the Old Man celebrate his birthday; and as they left, Burroughs made them all promise that they would come back one year from that day to help him celebrate his next birthday.

They all came back. On one side of the plain and simple casket stood Dallas Lore Sharp, Henry Ford, Harvey Firestone, and four or five more of his best friends. They had all come back. Then, when the funeral was over, Dr. Sharp and Mr. Ford went walking along the gravel paths leading away from Slabsides. "What is it, Mr. Ford," Dr. Sharp wanted to know, "what is it that has brought you back here once each year to help old John Burroughs keep his birthday? Your world is remote from his: there would seem to have been little in common between your lives. Why did you return here year after year upon this day?"

Mr. Ford stopped for a moment. His foot toyed with a pebble on the path. And he thought solemnly for awhile before he answered: "I do not know. I do not know. But I believe it was because, somehow or another, old John Burroughs always gave me back my soul!"

"Ideas belong to him who can use them. Use any that come from my direction," Dallas Lore Sharp wrote me from Mullen Hill just about a year before his own tragic death. So it is that I have used Dr. Sharp's story—though it will always remain his story and time itself cannot add to the poignant import of its retelling.

It is the same with books. We come back again and again only to those that, somehow or other, touch so deeply the profound verities of life that they give us back our souls. In observing this, we should become aware of one of the most egregious weaknesses of our American letters since the War: whereas certain of our writers have counted, not unreasonably, upon many readers not always recognizing the rational limitations of the various "isms" which they exploited, they failed to see that even

readers who cannot be appealed to on philosophic grounds, can almost inevitably be appealed to with ideals of self-respect and the finer emotions. All these come within the province of the soul.

In other words, certain readers may quite possibly fail to understand the intellectual criteria by which bad writing may be condemned, but they cannot fail to feel, with the fullest powers of the soul, all the repugnance and emptiness of meaning which attend such reading matter. Thus, it is that in the debacle of our literature since 1914—or even since the *fin de siècle*—certain writers have been fooling no one but themselves. They have foolishly counted upon the manifest indiscriminations of a general reading public, but have failed to count upon the ingrained sensibilities of a universal reading public that knows it possesses, in each case, a soul. For, if some novels have lived while others have died, it is not because some have proved compelling by their ineluctable or coldly logical consistency, and others have not. It is rather because some remind us that we have souls, while others fail to do so.

More even than a demonstrable certainty is the truth of what I am saying. How coldly and superbly accurate, to take but one example, are all the novels of Mrs. Wharton! And yet, of all her undeniably skilful portraits, which are we most likely to want to read again? Not the fatuously dull woman in a later novel who observes that living with another man has been a "beautiful" adventure. Not any of the creatures of large and mysterious incomes—not any of them with souls—to whom divorce has become a habit and marital infidelity a matter of family pride. Not the characters like the one who remarks that a certain friend of his who is about to buy a Rolls Royce really ought to buy two. But rather the few of her characters who, in a flash of spiritual insight, pause to ask themselves just where they are going in one Rolls Royce. In other words, Mrs. Wharton's characters, and not her puppets.

In the ultimate analysis it seems to me that it is just this soul-less-ness which completes the basic philosophic repulsiveness of most of our literary tendencies today. Humanists and anti-humanists may argue the pros and cons of naturalism—of the necessity of predicating man as a being possessed of free will—they may argue this to no avail, I suggest, until their academic copses and Bohemian garrets grow loud with their own hollow silences. Only when they predicate a soul, will they become effective.

Indeed, when Henry Hazlitt some time ago said that "we may reject . . . the notion that values need religion as a 'technique' to 'validate' them," and that "we may dispense with supernatural sanctions" altogether, did he not by these very words expose the obvious limitations of the whole anti-humanist group to which he subscribes? But, by the same tokens, in their cold detachment from religion, in their worship upon Bunker Hill instead of Calvary, do not Paul Elmer More and his urbane colleagues lay themselves open to a similar charge of repudiating spirit and religious sanction? Whatever the divided

strength of both groups may happen to be, they assuredly hold their weakness in common.

For the effete and snobbish gentility of the one must seem as odious and unnatural as the raucous clamor of the other. Nor will the suggestion, made recently, that humanist and anti-humanist compose their differences and lie down peacefully upon the same pillow, ever prove practical until both, before dropping off into their spasmodic slumbers, have a good talk together and agree that real literature should portray men and women who have souls.

It should be unnecessary to adduce many examples. But a crop of recent novels on my desk should suggest clearly the drift of my meaning. On one pile is Margaret Ayer Barnes's "Within this Present," finely written, no doubt, but far too smugly remote from the world of genuine feeling and the soul, to merit anything but the most casual and cold reading. The characters are actually as cold and soul-less as the Sewall bank that determines their fortunes. (I do not, of course, expect anything else from a novelist who could recently talk about the fortunate effect of the depression upon children—and this on the very day that the Child Welfare League informed us there would be 600,000 American children homeless this winter!)

There are other books on this pile. The latest tawdry effort by Warwick Deeping has a beauty completely lost for me when at the end a happy marriage crowns the glory of the two central characters only to make them agree that they do not want children who would have to be told of their parents' sufferings. These are not two souls speaking. Dorothy Canfield Fisher's new novel also lets us down. She has become interested only in bodies, and the family life which she formerly described with such discernment is now, too, nothing but a relationship of fleshly bodies. Six other novels on this pile have the same effect. Why mention them?

But there is the other pile on my desk. Here are novels which we should care to read again. Here are novels which show that our writers are beginning to be aware that we do have souls. Masefield's "The Bird of Dawning," for example. The clean beauty of ships is in this book, and a fine feeling for the sea. Even it seems to have a soul. Listen to the description of the "Blackgauntlet": "She was going like a bird of the sea, and the music of her going was a gurgle of water, and the tinkling rush of the scuppers running rain." Or hear old Captain Duntisbourne insist that ". . . men master the elements; in that there is beauty and fitness." How different from the soul-less naturalism which insists that life and the elements master men!

In the same class is Rose Wilder Lane's "Let the Hurricane Roar," a story detailing the brave existence of a girl on our prairies. Compare Caroline's reflections with those of the fatalist who holds that "man is in the play of inscrutable and cruel forces":

. . . she knew the infinite smallness . . . of life in the lifeless universe. She felt the vast, insensate forces against which life itself is a rebellion. Yet valiantly the tiny heart continued to beat. Tired,

weak, burdened by its own fears and sorrows, still it persisted, indomitably it continued to exist, and in bare existence itself . . . it was invincible.

Which point of view is more acceptable to the instinctive spirituality in all of us?

"Precious Jeopardy," by Lloyd Douglas, is another story which will remain perennially fresh, because it comes close to the soul of a man who yawned at the abyss of death and found itself again on the high plane of a spiritual life. And in "Miss Bishop," by Bess Streeter Aldrich, Ella Bishop sacrifices all for the child she has come to love:

As time went by, and a measure of surcease came, there grew in the inner court of her heart a little garden of fragrance from which the rank growth of noxious weeds had been miraculously removed. Ella Bishop reflects: "This was cleansing. This was purifying. To pass on the living flame."

Silver Grenoble, in Martha Ostenso's "There's Always Another Year," will likewise endure—because hers is a lofty idealism which elevates her above the physical temptation of her love for Roddy. "And across her shoulder Silver saw a rainbow above the land."

We shall want to come back to books like these. We shall want to come back to them because—if I may be allowed to quote myself—they show us that more and more our writers are coming to write books with one window open towards infinity. I honestly believe they are coming to discover our souls.

REVIEWS

A Great and Humble Soul. By HENRY PERROY, S.J. Translated by JOHN J. BURKE, C.S.P. New York: Paulist Press. \$1.50.

Ever since Rationalism and Materialism floundered in the maelstrom of a demoralized civilization, there have been evident signs of a return to God, to Christ, to the Folly of His Cross for solution of the world's problems. More than ever prayer and charity and humility are coming to their rightful place in the armament of all who would suppress the revolt against God. The retreat movement is a remarkable sign of this rekindled faith. Much has been done to further retreat work by the Society of Our Lady of the Retreat in the Cenacle. The story of its Foundress is touchingly told in this volume by Father Perroy, S.J., and Father Burke has done a service in giving it so charming an English dress. The life of Marie Victoire Thérèse Couderc, later Mother Thérèse and founder of the Religious of St. Regis, from which branched the Religious of the Retreat, now known as the Religious of the Cenacle, is a thrilling, mystic story of a little French girl who chose prayer, silence, and humility as steps towards perfection and instruments for leading souls in the world back to fervent faith. It proves that even in these modern days great servants of Christ must walk with Him along the Way of the Cross, and become like Him in self-immolation. Father Perroy presents the facts simply, with many quotations from original documents which show the high degree of spiritual perfection attained by this humble soul. It is not a perfect biography as literary works go, but it is an edifying and stimulating picture full of wisdom and insight. Those who make retreats can learn from Mother Thérèse's example how real and practical is the Third Degree of St. Ignatius. The book is well printed, and bound in an attractive cover.

F. D. S.

Paderewski: The Story of a Modern Immortal. By CHARLES PHILLIPS. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$4.00.

It is a memorable coincidence that such a splendid literary effort of this brilliant author should be published so shortly after

the news of his untimely death. It may be his *monumentum aere perennius*. Gifted with artistic temperament, a lover of music and poetry, pursuing intellectually the beautiful and true in life, Mr. Phillips was strongly attracted to Ignace Jan Paderewski for many years. Through close friendship with Madame Modjeska and Sigismund Stojowski he came to know intimately the inner life and character of his hero. Drawn to Poland during reconstruction following the World War he saw first hand the other side of the great artist. As the author says: "The story of Paderewski is two stories, or, as it were, the story of two men." Much as the genius of the musician fascinated him, and the personality of the man charmed him, it was the heroic role of the savior of Poland's freedom that fired the poetic soul of the author and gave the ideal which he has so truthfully depicted in these 542 pages. Everywhere he shows the painstaking care and insight of the biographer in penetrating the soul of this complexity of genius. Quotations of conversations and personal experiences abound to throw light upon the ideals and motives, the qualities and perfections of the man. In a style that flows like a gentle stream, with diction often bordering on the poetic, the author faithfully paints the picture of the musician and the statesman. It may surprise many to learn that Paderewski was a statesman and national hero less by chance and fortuitous circumstances than by inborn gifts of patriotism and personal character. His love of country, his sense of social justice, his fearless leadership combined gracefully with his patient, persistent cultivation of music and the arts. The volume is handsomely bound. B. R. E.

Figures in the Drama of Salvation. By JOHN A. MCCLOREY, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company. \$1.50.

The world in spite of its suffering from skepticism, jealousy, worldliness, and pleasure, even from the depths of the sufferings of depression holds to hope and longs for restored confidence. Seeming to forget that history repeats itself, revealing the virtues and vices of humanity, men constantly seek new solutions to economic evils as if the present and future were entirely independent of the past; as if the enlightened intelligence of man today so far surpasses the decadent intellect of yesterday as to be able to prove conclusively that sin is not a reality; that there is no difference between good and evil; the moral law is a myth and God non-existent. Father McClorey very clearly describes outstanding characters of the past whose examples have been projected even into our modern era as worthy of imitation or as a warning. The author in twelve sermons presents these various personalities as types of confidence, penance, prayer, faith, brotherly love, and others—virtues which are the very root of Christian life. The author has written anew principles which are as old as Christianity itself, yet so modernly applicable in this present economic crisis, in a style which will appeal to many readers. The author definitely shows that the past is very much a part of the present and the future.

S. M. C.

The Roosevelt Revolution. By ERNEST K. LINDLEY. New York: The Viking Press. \$2.50.

The author tells us that he has written his book primarily from his own personal knowledge, accumulated as a newspaper man, first with the *New York World*, and at present with the *Herald Tribune*. He writes as one who has observed Franklin D. Roosevelt at close range since he became Governor of New York in 1929. Much of his material has never been printed before. He presents the President as an honest, clear-headed, progressive, and firm leader. The subject matter of the book is a very detailed and accurate record of the Roosevelt policy and administration. Though the author writes with a distinct leaning towards the President, he never allows his predilection to mar the impartiality expected of a chronicler of facts, and their interpreter. The author entitles his book "The Roosevelt Revolution." One can agree with him. For the present Administration, particularly the NRA, is putting industrialists, capitalists, employers, and workmen, in

fact the entire nation, through a process of an industrial education, which is more effective than a whole library or a staff of professors could be. It is a complete breaking away from ancient moorings. In his book Mr. Lindley gives the reader in an interesting and narrative style a very comprehensive, clear, and accurate account of this revolutionary process. The early development of the President's political ideas and the NRA are given particularly well. Mr. Lindley's book is indispensable for an extensive knowledge of this period.

P. H. B.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

International Problems.—On the eve of the World Economic Conference the National Industrial Conference Board, 247 Park Avenue, New York City, published in its series of related reports a booklet on "Economic Conditions in Foreign Countries" (cloth: \$2.00). Dealing with the years 1932-33, this report condenses in concise and accurate fashion recent information on the development of world trade, international distribution of gold, world commodity prices, currency depreciation, etc. Trade conditions in seventeen foreign countries (not including Russia) are briefly reviewed.

"The World Adrift" is the significant title of the first in a new series of pamphlets issued jointly by the Foreign Policy Association, New York, and the World Peace Foundation, Boston, and obtainable from either at \$2.00 a year (paper edition) and \$4.00 (cloth edition); or 50 cents single copies. Raymond Leslie Buell, author of this first number in the series, reviews briefly the present condition of the international world, undertaking no prophecies. With his wide background of information, he presents a useful survey, free from technicalities and annoying details. One might question whether his preoccupation with the major dictatorships should have made him say so little of the Austrian regime. He is not quite clear as to what are the "guiding principles" of the Soviet State. Is "social responsibility" actually the guiding principle of the former? And is it true that there was "no unemployment problem" felt in Russia in 1929?

Those who desire a convenient and popular summary of the facts about Poland, her history, culture, and people, will find it in "Poland, Land of the White Eagle," (New York: Wyndham Press. \$2.50) by Edward C. Corsi, former Flight Commander of the Kosciuszko Squadron. In easy and graceful style, Captain Corsi unrolls the picture of Poland's greatness and beauty, ancient and modern, as well as her natural resources and economic progress. Maps and an attractive selection of illustrations complete the book. Ukrainians and the Ukraine, however, do not come into the picture, except as Poland's "enemies" to be fought. Lithuania and the Lithuanians are not mentioned at all, even in connection with Mickiewicz.

Concerning History.—With the title "Our Earliest Colonial Settlements" (New York University Press. \$2.50), six lectures by Prof. Charles M. Andrews of Yale University make an attractive and instructive picture of the social units of America's past. He has taken the three leading forms, the commercial, the religious, and the proprietary, as illustrated in Virginia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Maryland, and, with a comparative study of their origins, strives to clarify and define their remarkable individual peculiarities. In view of the coming tercentenary commemorations the chapter on Maryland has a special interest.

"Historical Material" (Oxford University Press. \$2.50), by Lucy Maynard Salmon, is a posthumous publication of Miss Salmon, of Vassar. It contains nine chapters of a longer work that was never finished, together with four miscellaneous essays. The opening chapter on "What is History?" will be read with interest; as also the concluding essay on the question: "What is Modern History?" It cannot be said that the editing has achieved a perfect success. Many little errors have been permitted to remain which Miss Salmon would no doubt have corrected. Thus on page 16 there is mention made of "Michel Angelo's conception

of the Last Judgment" on "the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel." That masterpiece is, of course, on the west wall. And then, too, "the critic . . . in hell, with a great serpent wound around his waist" is in reality merely Minos, according to Dante's conception, with his own tail wrapped around him. Minos, it is true, is supposed to have the face of Biagio da Cesena, who is said to have criticized the nudity of Michelangelo's figures.

Rediscovering the Soul.—Rudolf Allers has added one more worthwhile book, "The New Psychologies" (Sheed & Ward. \$1.00), to the psychological bookshelf. It is a small volume, but it is well-packed with good things of the mind. The two systems of Freud and Adler are discussed succinctly but adequately, Freud coming in for most consideration. Dr. Allers considers psychoanalysis both in theory and practice as not worth much attention. In his illuminating chapter on "The New Psychologies and the Old Faith" he remarks that "the latest developments . . . tend towards the acknowledgment of the soul as an existing substance" (p. 58) and so, "though they may not be aware of it, those scholars who are today endeavoring to enlarge our knowledge of psychology are contributing to the '*philosophia perennis*'" (p. 80).

In his book, "The Living Universe" (Dutton. \$3.00), Sir Francis Younghusband is on the side of the angels, only the angels would not subscribe to everything he writes. He finds both matter and spirit in the universe, and a guiding Mind back of it; but he goes astray when he makes this "Cosmic Spirit" exist in the universe as its soul. This Mind works in each part of the universe, making all evolve; and it has evolved life here and in other quarters. It is readily seen that Sir Francis' approach is that of a well-meaning idealist who lacks the safe anchorage of sound philosophy and religion.

Political Studies.—Here is that book you have been looking for ever since the time that foreign affairs began to dominate the front page of your newspaper. If the World Court remains a mystery to you, if you still shamefacedly skip the day's news about disarmament, if you never did grasp exactly what Mussolini is aiming at, if for years you have been promising yourself to read up the whole story of the U.S.S.R., the Polish Corridor, the French troubles, the War debts, and the monetary problem, you will find all the answers in "The Intelligent Man's Review of Europe Today" (Knopf. \$3.00). G. D. H. and Margaret Cole have made world affairs intelligible. The reading is a bit heavy at times, but fully worth the effort.

In his book "A Citizen Looks at Governmental Conditions" (Christopher. \$1.50), Neal Smith Whisenhunt discusses, rather superficially, the principal present-day evils and as a remedy offers a non-partisan and a non-political league with operating units in every county, supported by experts and advisers and the Board of Directors of Chambers of Commerce. Its purpose would be to promote good government. But, like the League of Nations, the author's plan, though good, would meet with insuperable difficulties. Selfishness and altruism are not good bed-fellows.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

AMERICAN ADVENTURE, THE. M. J. Bonn. \$2.50. John Day.
L'APOSTOLATO LAICO DI VICO NECCHI. Silvio Vismara, O.S.B. Vita e Pensiero.
AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JOHN KEATS. Compiled by E. V. Weller. \$5.00. Stanford University Press.
CHRIST-ROI, LE. Dom de Monléon. 5 francs. Téqui.
DERNIÈRE RETRAITE DU R. P. DE RAVIGNAN. 10 francs. Téqui.
DESTINÉE, LA. R. P. Félix, S.J. 10 francs. Téqui.
ECONOMICS OF THE RECOVERY PROGRAM, THE. \$1.50. McGraw-Hill.
FEAR OF THE DEAD IN PRIMITIVE RELIGION, THE. Sir James George Frazer. \$4.00. Macmillan.
FOUR GOSPELS, THE. Translated by George M. Lamsa. \$2.50. Holman.
HOUR OF DECISION, THE. Oswald Spengler. \$2.50. Knopf.
INSTITUTIONES MORALES ALPHONSIANAE. 80 francs. Vitte.
LETTERS TO THE NEW ISLAND. W. B. Yeats. \$2.50. Harvard University Press.
LIFE RETURNS TO DIE. E. A. Herron. \$2.00. Bessinger.

The State Versus Elinor Norton. Sea Wall. McKee of Centre Street. Four Days' Wonder.

There are forty-six published volumes now to the credit of Mary Roberts Rinehart. Her latest, "The State Versus Elinor Norton" (Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.00) is her first "realistic" novel. In 1931 she gave us "My Story," the very graphic and entertaining record of her own remarkable and varied career. In it, speaking of "realism," in regard to her writings and the new trend of current fiction, she justified her refusal to adapt it by saying: "I had my children to consider . . . nor would I write a line that they could not read." Continuing, in the application of this standard to her general audience, she added, "If it wanted its passions soured and its lower instincts appealed to, let it read elsewhere." Many of her admirers will regret the absence of this precaution in the novel—not one of her usual mystery stories—just published. It is a recital of the unsavory doings of a group of unmoral characters, portrayed in realistic fashion pandering to groveling tastes.

Of late we have come to expect novels of high literary skill from the younger writers of Ireland. The catastrophes of war and revolution and social change seems to have shaken the very soul of the race and loosened the tongues of the prophets. "Sea Wall" (Knopf. \$2.50), by L. A. G. Strong, offers us further proof of the progress of one of the most sensitive and competent novelists of the new group. Unconventional without being exotic, poetic without being florid, it is a happy story of the life of Nicky D'Olier from his childhood to manhood. "Sea Wall" has its local habitation in two beautiful houses on the sea coast of Ireland where Nicky gradually grows into the mysterious complication of living. The questions which first perplexed his childish thoughts, the reason for his parent's quarrels, the silence about Dr. Wilson's past, the broken pieces of experience are finally put together gently and fondly. Of plot in the formal sense there is very little evidence. The book is really a series of glowing images and experiences artistically strung together, for Mr. Strong, like W. B. Yeats, believes that "Wisdom first speaks in images." "Sea Wall" is a happy blend of the personal essay and the narrative which will undoubtedly appeal to the discriminating reader. Its idyllic story will please the lovers of the beautiful.

Helen Reilly's new book, "McKee of Centre Street" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.00), will prove interesting for two excellent reasons. First, it tells in fiction form the methods used by the New York City police department in solving murder mysteries—"exact authenticity," the publishers say. And, secondly, it is a very good detective-mystery story in its own right. Rita Rodriguez, an entertainer in a West Side speakeasy, is murdered while dancing under a spotlight, with the rest of the crowded room in darkness. Inspector McKee utilizes to the utmost the many facilities of the police department in searching for the murderer, in sifting the good from the bad in the mixture of clues confronting them. While spending a very entertaining hour or two, the reader gains a knowledge of police methods that seem to be accurately portrayed.

"Four Days' Wonder" (Dutton. \$2.00), by A. A. Milne, is a whimsically fascinating account of the breathless adventures of youthful Jenny from the moment when she discovers the body of her aunt, Jane Latour, in the drawing room of her old home. In graceful lyric style Mr. Milne relates the varied wonders that came into the life of romantic Jenny aided by Nancy, her feminine confederate, with the imagination of a novelist and the technique of an old-fashioned actress. Milne's astute understanding makes his women characters living realities. Jenny's hero; his brother, author and sophisticate; the inspector; the coroner; her solicitor and aged guardian; "Hussar," her soldier father and co. fidant, are all portrayed with an economy of words and action that tie the present to the past and reveal such love, laughter, joy, romance, humor, and surprise, as to make the story, according to Alexander Woolcott, "one of the best mysteries of all times." It is delightful reading.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Progress of the Chant

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Father Boyle deserves credit for his frankness regarding the non-compliance of some of our Catholic institutions of learning, convents, yes, and even monasteries, to the expressed commands (not requests) of the Holy See. It is interesting to note that the Chant is the only subject that the Pope has positively legislated for in all our schools—from the primary school to the seminary.

However, let one dare try to change existing conditions! Some of the dear old Sisters just love the little ditties that were sung at their reception or profession years ago! "They are so sweet, don't you know?" A profession wouldn't be a profession without them. Sweet? Yes! Sugary nothings!

Some there are who build fine liturgical churches, but are entirely oblivious to the incongruity of permitting not only cheap, but forbidden, musical compositions within its walls. And this not only in parishes, but in motherhouses. I recall an instance told me by a competent critic of a Solemn Requiem Mass offered not so long ago for the repose of the soul of the good Superioress who had built such a chapel. Apparently these Sisters never heard of the "Motu Proprio," and yet they advertise the exceptional music advantages in their academy. Few rubrical prescriptions were kept by their choir. In fact, said the critic, it was a burlesque. What a sad commentary on those who should be the first to obey the Pope by reason of their vow!

I have often wondered if we Catholics have not unconsciously imbibed some of the private principles of the Protestant communities in which we live.

I heartily second the warm commendation given in your last issue of the splendid work done by Murywood College, in accordance with the "Motu Proprio." Other places in Pennsylvania where I have experienced the same pleasure are the motherhouses of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Baden, the Lithuanian Sisters of Jesus Crucified, Elmhurst, the Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Refuge, Erie, and the Slovak Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, Danville.

Other motherhouses where the "Motu Proprio" is not a dead letter, are those of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Springfield, Mass.; Hartford, Conn.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Rochester and Buffalo, N. Y., the I. H. M.'s of Philadelphia, the Sisters of Mercy, Hartford, Conn.; Dallas, Penna., and Buffalo, N. Y., and the Sisters of Charity of Our Lady of Refuge of the same city.

If one half as much time were devoted to the proper teaching of the chant as is now spent in secular music, the dream of Pius X and of our present Pontiff would come true.

Boston.

FATHER JUSTIN, C.P.

Washington Welshes on Wages

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have just read "Washington Welshes on Wages," by John Wiltbye in the issue of AMERICA for January 27. As a Federal employe I feel that I should write to thank you for myself and for many others to whom I have shown the article. I hope you send a copy to the President, for his treatment of the Federal employes and of the veterans is certainly one of the mysteries of this Administration. I am getting \$400 less now when I have a wife and three children than I did thirteen years ago when I had no dependents. And the Treasury pays out millions to the corporations!

Address withheld.

A. F. E.

Chronicle

Home News.—The monetary bill desired by the President was passed by the Senate on January 27, by a vote of 66 to 23, after amendments had been defeated by Administration forces. The House accepted the Senate amendments on January 29, and President Roosevelt signed the bill on January 30. The first action was taken on January 31. The President signed a proclamation reducing the gold weight of the dollar from 25.8 grains to 15 5/21 grains, setting a gold value of the dollar of 59.06 cents; took title for the Government on all gold held by the Federal Reserve Banks, for which new gold certificates will be given; and fixed \$35 as the price the Government will pay per fine troy ounce for gold mined in or delivered to the United States. A dollar profit of \$2,792,876,058 was created on the gold from the Reserve Banks, and \$2,000,000,000 of this was set up to be used as a fund to stabilize the dollar on international exchange at as near 59.06 cents as possible, and also, when necessary, to support the Government bond market. The fund will be operated by the Secretary of the Treasury. This action of the President puts the United States on an international gold bullion standard. The official reason for the devaluation act was the necessity of protecting our foreign trade from the effects of depreciated currencies in competing nations, and also that domestic conditions call for an expansion of credit. The announcement brought about a swift decline in the dollar in foreign exchange, while in the United States prices on the stock exchanges rose rapidly. On January 27, the President asked Congress for an additional appropriation of \$950,000,000 to continue the work of the Emergency Relief Administration and the Civil Works Administration. This amount is to supply direct relief during the remainder of this fiscal year and next year, and \$350,000,000 to continue the CWA until May 1. On January 30, the House passed the Vinson Naval Replacement bill, providing a program to cost from \$475,000,000 to \$570,000,000, making the greatest peace-time navy in the country's history. It authorized sixty-five destroyers, thirty submarines, one aircraft carrier, and 1,184 airplanes to equip the ships now under construction. The House Ways and Means Committee on January 25 voted drastic revision of the Income Tax Law to increase its yield by \$200,000,000, through heavier levies on incomes from other than labor and business enterprises. The President's special committee reported on January 27, recommending legislation to put the operations of stock exchanges under the supervision of a Federal agency. Another committee on the same day suggested a Governmental agency to regulate the communication systems—telegraph, telephone, and radio. On January 30 the nation celebrated the President's fifty-second birthday, with more than 6,000 dinners and balls being held for the benefit of the Warm Springs Foundation. It was estimated that the receipts will reach \$1,500,000.

New French Cabinet.—In the turmoil over the Stavisky 200,000,000-franc scandal while street rioting in Paris rose to a climax, the Chautemps Government resigned. Two days later, on January 29, President Lebrun, after merely formal invitations to ex-President Doumergue and to the Senate and Chamber presidents, asked Edouard Daladier to form a new government. His failure to interview M. Herriot, who seemed the logical choice for the post in the opinion of nearly everyone, was notable. The new Premier is a Radical Socialist by party affiliation but he immediately formed a coalition cabinet, filling the posts with members of the moderate parties and veering more to the Right and Center than any of the preceding Premiers. Only two strong men were included, however: François Piétri, as Minister of Finance, and Col. Jean Fabry, as Minister of Defense. M. Daladier announced that he would not appear before the Chamber for a vote of confidence until a full week had passed. Observers predicted that he had a difficult task ahead of him. The Tardieu Center Republican group, by expelling Colonel Fabry from the party, indicated its opposition to the Premier; all the extreme nationalists will vote against him. On the Left, Léon Blum's Socialists are his enemies. It was believed that with the extreme Right and Left opposed to him the new Premier could hold power only if the Socialists and the Herriot group refrained from voting, and if besides, he could convince the Chamber that the time was a time of crisis in which party quarrels must be laid aside.

Austria's Condition Problematical.—Such confusion existed in Austria that it was difficult to know whether Chancellor Dollfuss with his Patriotic Front could hold out in the face of growing opposition. In a public speech on January 28 Prince von Starhemberg went so far as to announce that he would personally negotiate with Chancellor Hitler under certain specified conditions. He demanded the recognition in writing of Austria's independence; he refused any terms in negotiation with the present Austrian Nazis; he offered the Heimwehr as the representative of Fascism in Austria which was willing to support Germany in her foreign policies. The feared *coup d'état* of the Austrian Nazis planned for January 30 fizzled out. Dollfuss' strongest hope lay in the support of the larger European Powers and the Little Entente who seemed willing to support Austria in preserving independence. On January 29 the Austrian Peasants' Association paraded in Vienna in demonstration of loyalty to Dollfuss. The Government continued its drive on the Nazis and Socialists, the latter being suspected of making overtures to the Nazis.

Germany's Domestic Problems.—It was difficult to determine the status of the Protestant revolt against Dr. Mueller and the Nazi control of the Lutheran Church. Failing to secure agreement on a Cabinet, the Reich Bishop decided to end the impasse by declaring himself Supreme Spiritual Dictator over all Prussian Protestants and proceeded to suspend all pastors who had announced

their revolt from their pulpits on January 1. The Rev. Martin Niemoeller refused to submit and was arrested by the Nazi police. Over a hundred members of the Pastors' Emergency League were involved in the suspension. It was reported that many ministers submitted to the dictatorship of Dr. Mueller, thus wrecking the program of Protestant resistance. Chancellor Hitler celebrated the first birthday of his regime by convoking his hand-picked Reichstag and delivering a two-hour panegyric on National Socialism. The chief purpose of the Convention was the abolition of all State Governments, reducing them to obedient parts of the central Nazi control. Herr Schmitt, Minister of Economics, declared that the Reich labor law was diminishing unemployment.

Germany Celebrates.—On January 27 the seventy-fifth birthday of the former Kaiser was celebrated with festivities at Doorn. While Germany rejoiced, the Nazis made it clear that this was no time for discussion of a return of the Hohenzollerns. Hitler frankly declared that the decision on the type of constitution that Germany would adopt could not be reached now; but that when it should be determined, the people would have the deciding vote. The night before, a meeting of the German Officers' League was broken up, and it was announced that the regular Stahlhelm would be merged with the Hitler Storm Troops. At the same time General Von Horn, President of the Kyffhaeuser League, resigned, ending another independent veterans' organization. On January 30 Germany celebrated the victory of the Nazis, the anniversary of Hitler's appointment as head of the Reich.

Germany Agrees on Bonds.—A compromise agreement was reached on January 31 with foreign holders of German bonds. The Reich agreed to pay seventy-seven per cent instead of fifty per cent as proposed by Dr. Schacht. Interest payments would be made thirty per cent in cash and seventy per cent in scrip; but the scrip issued after January 1 would be redeemable at sixty-seven per cent of its face value. This meant that Americans will receive an additional \$3,200,000 in actual payments. The Conference adjourned until April when a final solution will be sought.

Cuban Events.—The properties of the Cuban Cane Products Company passed into the hands of four New York banks on January 30 through a forced sale to satisfy debts amounting to about \$4,125,000. President Mendieta signed a decree returning to the owners the Delicias and Chaparra sugar mills in the Oriente Province. They had been seized by former-President Grau when the management had closed down because of labor difficulties. Jefferson Caffery, United States Ambassador to Cuba, was completing arrangements to sell \$2,000,000 worth of food products to the Mendieta Government for emergency relief work. It was thought that this was the first of a series of contracts totaling about \$10,000,000 for food products desired by the Cuban Government. Some

30,000 tobacco workers struck on January 31 in sympathy with the employees of the Partagas and Hupmann factories. These employees were dissatisfied with the present location of their factories, a short distance outside of Havana, and were agitating their removal into the city. Left-wing university and high-school students were adding to the confusion by continued public protests and disorderly demonstrations. These youths were thought to be the tools of radical agitators who were determined to embarrass the Mendieta Administration. The portfolio of the Secretary of Labor remained unfilled, as the Government was apparently unable to find a man willing to assume this difficult office. The labor situation, an inheritance from the Grau régime, was looked upon as the most difficult problem now facing the new Mendieta Government.

Stalin's Speech.—In a four-hour speech before the All-Union Communist party congress on January 27 Joseph Stalin, general secretary of the Communist party, sounded a warning against imperialist war. Mistakes of officials, particularly in the agricultural program, were bitterly criticized and livestock "casualties" revealed for the first time. The number of horses dropped from 34,000,000 in 1929 to 16,500,000 last year; cattle from 68,100,000 to 38,600,000; sheep and goats from 147,200,000 to 50,600,000, and pigs from 20,900,000 to 12,200,000. These losses were the result of wholesale slaughtering by the peasants to prevent authorities from forcing them to pool their animals in collective farms.

Altitude Tragedy.—The Soviet civil stratosphere balloon Osoaviakhim 1 greatly exceeded the world's official altitude record on January 30 by reaching a height of 67,585 feet. The official record was set by Lieut. Commander T. G. W. Settle and Major Chester L. Fordney, of the United States, who attained an altitude of 61,237 feet in November, 1933. Exultation over the achievement changed to profound grief when the news arrived at Moscow on the following day that the three Soviet airmen who had made the ascent were killed instantly when the balloon crashed to the ground between 3:30 and 5 p.m. on January 31, near Potitsky Ostrog, about 150 miles east of Moscow. The gondola and all the scientific apparatus it contained were smashed.

New Disarmament Suggestions.—Disarmament proposals were issued by both Great Britain and Italy on January 31, the Italian being made public two hours before the British. The latter were practically a recasting of the draft convention of last March and were regarded as a last desperate effort to save the disarmament conference. Somewhat awkward for the British was the Austrian crisis with Germany, rendering it more difficult to extend to Germany liberal proposals. The British took the stand that arms inequality cannot be indefinitely denied to the Germans; so that the heavily armed Powers should either abandon certain classes of armaments or at the very least undertake not to increase them. Security,

the French concern, would be guaranteed by new provisions for representation and consultation. The divergence between Germany's claim, in the matter of equality, for 300,000 men with the figure of 200,000 that France is now willing to allow her, would be met somewhere between the two figures. Tanks over certain categories would be destroyed, and there would be a limit on the size of land guns. Germans would be given equality in military aircraft. Germany would need to return to the League of Nations and the disarmament conference.

Italy's Plan.—Italy's disarmament proposal would last until December 31, 1940, and would comprise the following eight points: (1) *men*: 300,000 to Germany, unless an all-round reduction proposed; (2) *chemicals*: warfare with them abolished; (3) *bombardment*: none of civil population; (4) *expenditures*: limited to present levels of all nations not bound by special treaties; (5) *materials*: same as in No. 4, except for replacements; (6) *effectives*: to be negotiated; (7) *navies*: to be taken up at the next naval conference; (8) *Geneva*: Germany to return both to the League of Nations and to the disarmament conference. Italy, moreover, would approve a very extensive disarmament if all agree to the same. Italy holds that Germany's question of equality is paramount; that the question must be settled *now*, else grave danger of war; and that the good faith of the present German Government may be assumed. In the meanwhile Japan was reported as opposing the idea of naval ratios; while it was reported from Washington that a conference on this topic between Japan and the United States might be necessary in order to avoid conflict at the naval conference in 1935.

Self-Sufficiency in Ireland.—Ireland's policy of self-sufficiency was again reiterated by President de Valera when he declared that the results of the Government's action to increase the country's economic gains had made considerable progress. That the Government might have adequate press support, a decision was reached to establish a press bureau which would be attached to Mr. de Valera's own department. According to the official announcement, the object of the bureau will be to supply accurate information concerning the work of governmental departments to the home and foreign press. The work of the bureau will also include the function of correcting misstatements which would injure the credit or prestige of the country. Another reason for establishing the bureau was said to be the lack of press support during the trade war with Great Britain. Sean Lemass, the Minister of Industry, announced the completion of plans for the erection of six new plants where motor cars will be assembled that Ireland's steady growth in population might be absorbed in new industrial centers. The estimated population of the Irish Free State in the middle of 1933 was 2,992,000, an increase of 18,000 over the estimated population of 1932. This aspect of Ireland's economic and population problem had recently been the subject of critical consideration by such widely spread bodies as the University Graduates' Association and the trade

unions. Protests were made to the Government that even where trained and skilled workers were available, foreign workers were imported. The complaints cited that nothing as yet has been done to train workers from the body of professional and craft workers in the Free State. Too much training of Ireland's youth for the "black-coated and white-collared" occupations with little or no attention given to a comprehensive scheme of technical education was said to cause the lack of skilled and trained artisans which the new industrialization of the country needs.

Nanking Asks Treaty Revision.—Nelson T. Johnson, United States Minister to China, received a letter from the Nanking Government proposing a revision of the treaty of 1903 in accordance with the revision clause of that agreement. The belief was held that the request of the Chinese Government would reopen the whole vexed question of American extra-territorial rights, commercial relations, patents, and copyrights. The treaty of 1903 in Article XV pledges the United States to relinquish extra-territorial rights when satisfied with the status of China's laws and their administration. According to reports from Amoy on January 28, the Nineteenth Route Army was being reorganized as a new fighting body. The addition of this army will bring the strength of the Nanking forces in Fukien up to 100,000 men.

Japanese Foreign Affairs.—Speaking before the Diet on January 26, Foreign Minister Hiroto rebuked the Fascist member, Seijo Nakano, for exaggeration about the "crisis of 1935-36" and for demanding promulgation of an "Oriental Monroe Doctrine." He advised Mr. Nakano to use calmer language in discussing foreign affairs and to avoid the term *Oriental Monroe Doctrine*, which was liable to be misunderstood abroad. In a nation-wide radio broadcast Katsuji Debuchi, until recently Ambassador to Washington, paid a warm tribute to the United States and its peaceful intentions towards Japan. He reminded his hearers of America's service in giving young Japan the new national game of baseball, and buying Japan's silk, and of Japan's purchase of one fourth of America's exports.

Next week will begin a series of three articles by Basil C. Walker on the subject, "Is Social Justice Good Business?" The first article will be on the Historical Background.

With the beginning of Lent the layman wants a reasoned argument for the privations which the Church demands of him during that holy season. Francis P. LeBuffe will supply that next week in "Why Lent?"

"A Young Man Speaks" will be a piece by John Bayer, who will tell the older generation why he is all he is accused of being.

"A Certain Politician," by George Carver, will be a pen picture of any Catholic, whom many of us know.